

THE
AMERICAN QUARTERLY
CHURCH REVIEW,
AND
ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XVI.

APRIL, 1864.

No. 1.

ART. I.—INTERCOMMUNION OF THE EASTERN AND
ANGLICAN CHURCHES.—(*Continued.*)

Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church, with an Introduction on the Study of Ecclesiastical History. By ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, D. D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford, and Canon of Christ Church. New York: Charles Scribner. 1862.

No one can compare the Second and Third Tables which we have given,—the differences of the Greek and Anglican from the Roman, and the differences of the Greek and Roman from the Anglican,—without seeing that the former far exceed the latter in number and importance. No one can compare the First and Second Tables,—the differences between the Greek and Anglican, and the differences between those two and Rome,—without observing a striking preponderance in the latter. We differ not from the Greek, as we differ from the Latin. We are one with the Greek, in most of the very important things in which

we differ from the Latin. The Papal Supremacy, Purgatory, the general Celibacy of the Clergy, Communion in one kind, the Apocrypha, Divine Service in an unknown tongue,* Discouraging the use of Holy Scripture by the Laity, the novel Doctrine, as an Article of Faith, of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin,—take them, and their affiliated doctrines and usages, out of our differences from Rome, and what remains? Most of us would say, not enough to warrant us in keeping apart. Had these things been absent, 300 years ago, who can imagine, that the English Reformation would have occurred? or, if it had occurred, that it would have caused any separation between us and the Latin Church? The claim of the Papal Supremacy alone started the wave of the Reformation. It gathered volume and force as it rolled on, by the resistance of other unprimitive Doctrines and Practices, until it swept away the union of the Churches; and, even that was caused by the act of the Papacy, in opposing, to the rushing flood, its unlawful Decrees of Interdict and Excommunication. After all, it was Rome that severed the tie.

And here we have the Greek Church, one with us in most of those things which made us *Protestants*; so far one with us that, in our great controversy with Rome, the chief elements of the strife are the same which set the Greek in as earnest and persevering opposition to the same powerful foe; so far one with us that, for all practical purposes, our resources and our strength can be cordially combined, and harmoniously act together against the common antagonist, who equally hates us both; and yet, we, cautiously and timorously, venture to inquire, not how we may most speedily effect a union with her who is fighting the same battle with ourselves, but whether we may think of it, and enter into negotiation with a view to it.

* Each Nation, in the Communion of the Greek Church, uses its own language; e. g. the Greeks, the Greek, the Russians, the Slavonic. Thus the principle is conceded. If it be said, that the language of the Services is the old tongue, now not commonly understood by the people, the answer is, first, that it is far more widely understood than is generally supposed, and, secondly, that the modern tongue has not enough of fixedness and settled character, to allow a translation into it which could be a permanent standard.

This is about the position in which the matter was left by the last General Convention. We do not complain that its action was so narrow and so timid ; because, we believe that it went as far as the present temper of the Church will bear ; and, it is useless and unwise, it might be disastrous to ourselves, to attempt to accomplish practical results faster than the Church grows into the right understanding, and the true spirit, of the work. We must have patience and longanimity. The question is opened ; and that, in itself, is a great advance. Let us trust that it will never be closed, until many more and broader steps are taken ; not until the Greek and Anglican Churches stand side by side, and hand in hand, in face of her who claims to be "The Mother and Mistress of all Churches,"* and bear their united testimony to Catholic Faith and Catholic Practice.

But, we could wish, that, at the outset, a different temper and tone might prevail ; that there were a stronger and more positive desire for union ; that our relation to Rome, and the dangers which beset the truth of Christianity, from the progress of her domination, and her grievous advance in error, especially as regards the Worship of the Virgin, were more truly appreciated ; that we might feel more deeply our need of assistance in the great contest before us ; and, that we might estimate more clearly, more vividly realize, the incalculable advantage of such an accession to our strength as would be our Communion with the most ancient of the Churches ; filling, as she does, the old seats of Christianity, and embracing, as she does, a body of the Faithful equal to our own number, English and American, thrice told. We could wish, too, that there were less among us of a feeling towards her as if we were contemplating a favor to her ; as if we were, in some sort, her superior ; as if it were our proper province and right to sit in judgment on her. She is, at least, our equal ; in many respects, even as regards things primitive and apostolic, far before us ; while she sees in us defects and evils, not so apparent, perhaps, to our own eyes, which she believes to be a fair offset

* Creed of Pius IV.

to everything of fault and error that we can impute to her. She has never tampered with the Catholic Creed. She has not, like us, well nigh lost the practical use of the Diaconate, one of the Three Orders of the Ministry. She has not, like us, abandoned the Apostolical and primitive Discipline, and left herself without any effective jurisdiction over the Laity. She does not, like us, lose sight of her baptized children, leaving them to wander at will, without control or guidance, and, at last, to be lost in the world. She has not, like us, fallen into the general disuse of Daily Worship. In every town and in every village, and before every Altar, she offers, as of old, her Morning and Evening Sacrifice ; constantly interceding for all estates of men in Christ's Holy Church, and for the world dead in sin. She has not, like us, reduced the Sacrament of Holy Communion to a monthly celebration ; but, day by day, as in the ancient times, presents her Eucharistic Oblation, in perpetual memory of the precious death and sacrifice of the Son of God, and for remission of sin and all other benefits of His Passion, to the Faithful. To the Greek, the Sacrament may be, if he will, his Daily Bread. With us, the Penitent must pass an entire month without the chief of all the means of grace. She has not, like us, lost, to a great degree, her sense of union and vital connection with the primitive Church. Her laws are based upon the ancient laws. They are, mainly, the ancient laws themselves. She has no independent and novel legislation, resembling that of the Sects, which have cut loose from the old moorings. Her *Catholic* character is her ruling character. Ours is our *Protestantism* ; substituting the modern negative for the ancient positive. Her Parishes are marked and defined. Their mutual relations are settled and fixed. They cannot act, as with us, after the Congregational method ; in utter disregard of each other's rights and interests ; or to the injury, or neglect, of the welfare of the entire Body. Every man, woman and child, baptized, belongs to the Parish in which he, or she, lives ; and is subject to the oversight and discipline of the Church. We have seen a Priest sent into a poor district ; such as, with us, would be accessible only by a Mission from some wealthy Parish. His first act was to call

together the Baptized, as members of the Church. They all listened to his voice, as that of their rightful Pastor. The whole population was, at once, under his care and direction. And, more than that, their offerings and willing toil soon established, and afterward supported, the Church, without help from abroad. It was because that every one, young and old, was in living union with the Body of Christ into which he had been baptized. He acknowledged and bowed to her authority; and thus, from the united efforts and contributions of a great mass of poor people, the work went on successfully, from the start. Such a phenomenon is impossible here, only because the Church has no adequate rule over her children. The ancient Discipline was lost at the Reformation; and the wisdom and zeal of the Reformers, though diligently exerted, failed to replace it. Thus, we are left in an inchoate and imperfect condition; inferior to some sectarian bodies, in the laws which govern and regulate the rights, privileges and obligations of Church-membership; and in striking contrast with the higher and more primitive character of the Eastern Church.

It is not amiss to mention another corruption, flagrant among us, unknown among the Greeks: and that is the modern system of *Pews*. We imagine, that, if a Greek should hear of selling or letting Pews in Churches, he would be affected somewhat as was an aged Prelate of his Communion, to whom, in conversation, while making sundry distinctions between religious bodies, we used the term, "Episcopal Church."* "*Episcopal Church! Episcopal Church!*" said the old Bishop, stroking his snow-white beard, in puzzled surprise, "Why, who ever heard of a Church that was not Episcopal?" He had never dreamed of such a monstrosity. To him "Church" involved, of necessity, the *Episcopate*. We might as well have said, "Ecclesiastical Church." So the Greek, on first hearing

* Our title, "Protestant Episcopal Church," is partly offensive, and partly absurd, to a Greek. The word "Protestant" itself is in free use in Turkey, and means "Infidel." A Greek has become a disciple of Voltaire. His friends say, "He is a Protestant." While "Episcopal Church" is senseless tautology. Our name, rendered into Greek, would mean, "The Infidel Church which has Bishops." Does it deserve any better fate?

of "Pews," might exclaim, "Pews! Pews! Why, who ever heard of selling or letting any part of *God's House*?" It would be sacrilege in his sight.

There are, moreover, certain usages to which we have already alluded,* all of them primitive, some of them Scriptural, the absence of which in a Church professing to have reformed herself on the primitive model, a Greek can neither justify, nor understand. Let us give a list of them; imperfect, we know, yet sufficiently full for our purpose.

- I. Prayer for the Faithful Departed.
- II. Anointing the Sick, with Prayer.†
- III. Anointing in Baptism.
- IV. Anointing in Confirmation.
- V. Trine Immersion in Baptism.
- VI. The Sign of the Cross, in Confirmation.
- VII. The Sign of the Cross, in the Eucharistic Invocation.
- VIII. Praying towards the East; [in private, as well as in Church.]
- IX. Mixing water with the wine, in the Lord's Supper.
- X. Praying standing, on Sunday, the Feast of the Resurrection.
- XI. Private use of the Sign of the Cross.

Now, we do not enumerate these things as belonging, essentially, to the question of Intercommunion. We do not say, that a Greek would insist upon them as involving Terms of Communion. But some of them he regards as very important; especially, the First, Second and Fifth; the point, in the last, being, not so much the application of water three times, as the question of Immersion: Affusion, among the Greeks, being the practice, only, as in ancient times, in *Clinic* Baptism. This, however, determines its validity: and the objection of the Greek Church to our custom, would be, that

* Church Review, Vol. xv. p. 519.

† We have called this Rite, "Sanctified Oil." The Greek word, (*Εὐχέλαιον*), literally means *Prayer Oil*. As ministered in the Greek Church, it fulfills, exactly, the precept of the Apostle:—"Is any sick among you? let him call for the Elders (Presbyters) of the Church; and, let them pray over him, [not *with* him—it is a priestly act,] anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord." (St. James, v. 14.) For the use of the same Symbol, during our Saviour's Ministry, see St. Mark, vi. 13.

we admit in *all* cases, what was anciently thought justifiable, only in *extreme necessity*. This, she would say, is a corruption ; and it unquestionably is ; a corruption affecting even the *Doctrine* of Baptism : for, what becomes of the Burial with Christ, on which the ancient Fathers so much insist, as represented by Immersion, when water is merely poured, or sprinkled, upon the child ? So, also, the rising with Him, as symbolized in the emerging from the water ? But, it would not, therefore, be made a hindrance to Intercommunion. We know, that contradictory theories and practices have prevailed, at different periods, in the Greek Church, with regard to the validity of Western Baptisms ; and, we are aware, that, at the present day, in the Church of Turkey, though not in that of Russia, persons seeking admission from the Western Churches, Roman or Anglican, are sometimes, perhaps generally, re-baptized. But the most authoritative decision of the Greek Church on the subject, that of the Synod of Constantinople after the Council of Florence, is contrary to such practice ; and so is the usage of the Church in Russia. It cannot be defended, for a moment ; and, the reasons which Greek Clergymen give for it are frivolous, or inconsistent : the most sensible one being, that, in the imperfect use of water in Western Baptisms, it may sometimes be doubtful whether *any* water touches the child ; and, therefore, it is safest, as a rule, to baptize those coming to the Greek Communion. This excuse, however, does not deny, but rather acknowledges, the validity of those Baptisms, when water is actually applied. The present position of the Greek Church of Turkey, or, rather, of the Greek Clergy, on the subject, is untenable ; it is even absurd. It is contrary to the formal decision of Council, in the 15th Century ; which decision has never been reversed by a later Synod. When the ground is taken, as it sometimes is, by Greek Clergymen, that Western Baptism is invalid, because it is without Immersion, the argument is inconsistent with their own theory and practice, in Clinic Baptism ; of which they acknowledge the validity, though it, also, is without Immersion. And the *absurdity* of the position is manifest in the fact, that the Greek Church of Turkey receives, without

scruple, to full communion, members of the Russian Church, who have been admitted to that Body, from the Churches and Sects of the West without rebaptization.

The only solid argument which the Greek Church has against us, on the question of *Immersion*, is, that our prevailing practice is a departure from the Ecumenical custom of primitive times. Scripture, fairly interpreted by itself, or by the testimony of the ancient Fathers, is sufficiently clear to a candid mind. One who studies the subject without prejudice, can hardly doubt that Immersion was the mode of Baptism originally instituted—some of the Fathers expressly say, and none deny—by Christ Himself. And, that it was the universal custom for the first six centuries, with only such allowed exceptions as served to confirm the rule, Churchmen, we imagine, will generally admit. The disuse of it originated in the Church of Rome; beginning in France; extending thence into Germany and Italy; but, never prevailing in England, till after the Reformation: and, even now, the Rubric of the English Church is against it, except in case of weakness. The penalty which it has cost us, is the rise and growth of the great Sect of the Baptists, in this country largely outnumbering the Church. That evil might have been prevented, if the Church, or rather her Clergy, without authority from her, had not abandoned the ancient and universal mode of Baptism, that alone which expresses fully the Doctrine of Baptism. Long habit has made us familiar with our corrupt use; but, to a Greek, who knows only the old way which has been from the beginning, the innovation is as startling and as abhorrent as is, to us, his Worship of Pictures.

And here is the light in which we regard these our departures from ancient and Catholic usage. We would not allow such usages to be propounded as Terms of Communion; but we must be prepared, if we are disposed to reproach our Greek Brethren, for such superstitious practices as the Invocation of Saints and Honor shown to Pictures and Relics, to be reminded, that *we* are not immaculate; that we have as many corruptions, by omission, as they have by addition; that, if they have brought in much that is unscriptural and unprimitive,

we have lost as much which has the the authority of the Word of God, and of the first and best ages of the Church. We apprehend, that the chief resistance to Intercommunion, among ourselves, will be from those who lump up the Greek corruptions with Romanism ; and fancy, that their Protestantism, (which, and not their Catholicism, is their primal principle of religious action,) requires them to oppose any intercourse with a Body which bears these marks of the "Beast." And, we have as little doubt, on the other hand, that there are Greek extremists, who will question the wisdom, if not the right, of holding Communion with a Body, whose mode of Baptism has no authority in Scripture, or in the original institution of the Church. There are two sides to the question of corruption ; and our Ultra-Protestants must be prepared for defense, as well as for attack. It is not so safe a matter as many imagine, to assail the Greek Church, as if she were a monstrous holder of error, and we pure Christians of primitive days ; as if she were a diseased mass, hardly worthy to be acknowledged as of the Body of Christ, and we were a perfectly sound, uncrippled and healthful member, which, in the right of its irreproachable perfection, may say to her, "I have no need of thee."

According to the view which we are disposed to take, and to urge upon our readers, the question of Intercommunion is apart from, and superior to, these corrupt usages, on the one side, or on the other. The duty of Fellowship is based upon great Laws and Principles of our common Christianity, which cannot be displaced, and made inoperative, by anything of lower importance. An unprimitive and corrupt custom must not be suffered to defeat the fulfillment of so essential an obligation as that of Unity. We have, excepting only the contested clause in the Creed, a perfect Foundation for Oneness. We *are* One Body, by our common Faith, our equally Apostolic Ministry, our reception and use of the same Word of God, and of the Sacraments ordained by Christ. It seems to us, that this settles the question, both as to the Practicability, so far as principle is concerned, and the Duty, of active Communion ; because, these points present what is essential, and *all* that is essential, to Christian Fellowship. No one of us

would ask more, of positive grounds of Union. They make the act of Intercommunion an absolute Duty. The only allowable course, therefore, is to fulfill it. Minor points of difference should be matter, it seems to us, for subsequent, and not for preliminary, negotiation. Restore the active Communion on the substantial and sufficient basis which creates the obligation; and then, as brothers, filled with fraternal charity and an earnest desire for each other's welfare, discuss, and, if may be, settle, the family differences. They, certainly, cannot be settled while we remain apart, and do not, practically, acknowledge our real brotherhood. The Greek Church will never abandon its corruptions, nor we ours, while each attacks the other as an outside foe. We must come together on the platform of our real Brotherhood, which is an actually existing fact; we must openly acknowledge each other as Brothers, which we already are; we must, therefore, enter into the intercourse of Brothers; and then, if there are, as there are, points of difference between us, affecting the well-being of the one Family to which we belong, and in which we have equal rights and privileges, they should be subjects for amicable discussion and arrangement. The only just and righteous settlement, we believe, would be, for the Greek to resign his added practices, which cannot bear the test of Scripture and Primitive Authority, and for us to replace at least the most important usages commended to us by the same test, but which we have unfortunately lost.

However that may be,—and, the only hope of helping our Brethren out of their Corruptions, is by Union with them as Brethren,—we cannot set aside the obligation of Fellowship, of which all the positive conditions exist between us, on the ground of a corrupt usage. There can be *no* Communion on such terms; because, the Church of Christ no where exists, in a perfect condition, on earth; nor has ever so existed. Even the Apostolic Churches might have been excinded, one from another, on such a pretense. We can find no authority in Scripture, for violating the radical and essential Law of Unity, where there is One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism, and One divinely ordained Ministry for the edifying of the Body of

Christ, on the mere pretext that a corrupt custom exists among our Brethren. We have no such power over primal and fundamental Laws. The Head of the Church has no where accorded it to us. Unity is of the very essence and life of the Church, as the Kingdom of Christ, His Body; and Communion is the vital expression of Unity. So essential is it to the symmetry and the well-being of the Church, so strongly and clearly is it enjoined by the precepts of Christ and His Apostles, that to put it aside must require a most indubitably revealed authority. We have no such authority, the positive conditions of Communion being complete.

And yet, there are those who can elevate a few questionable usages, which better teaching and fraternal persuasion might soon correct, to such a rank of importance as, in their minds, to destroy the obligation of Communion, though all its original grounds still exist; while, in another direction, the want of those grounds in great part, the want, namely, of the Catholic Creed and of an Apostolic Ministry, is no sufficient reason for separation. They crave, and demand, Union where its original conditions do not appear; and, on account of an unscriptural custom, deny it where they are to be found; thus setting the evil custom above the ties which form the Unity of the Church. We say to such, with fraternal respect and affection,—You desire union with Presbyterians and other Protestants, on the score of a common reception of the Word of God, and of some of the cardinal Doctrines of Christianity; especially, on account of a common faith in Christ our Lord. You would judge it sufficient for Communion with them, if they were governed by Bishops. Nothing else that is essential is, in your judgment, wanting. But, let us ask,—Suppose this deficiency supplied, would they, on the whole, approach as nearly to us as do the Greeks? We believe, not. Consider, for a moment, wherein they would still be defective. They have no Creeds. They do not acknowledge the authority of Creeds, as being set forth by Decree of the Catholic Church. They do not, even, acknowledge the Doctrine of “One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church,” in the sense in which that Church herself propounded it, and has held it from the beginning. They have

no form or Order of Worship following the usage of all times, no Liturgic Service in common use. They have, therefore, no sufficient safeguard against Error. Their Doctrine of the Sacraments is widely different from that of the Prayer Book. And their peculiar theory of practical Religion finds no support in the standards of the Church. Now, what is there, in the Differences from us, in the Greek Church, which ranks, in importance, equal to these disparities, some of them touching the Foundation of the Faith?

But, it will be said,—These Brethren of the Denominations possess a living piety, the true spiritual bond between Christians, while the Greek Church is sadly deficient in all signs of the divine life. This, we know, is a plausible argument; but, it seems to us to miss the point. We are treating of Communion between Bodies of Christians called “Churches,” Visible Bodies, having organic forms and laws. Evidently, such Communion must be based, not upon the spirit which pervades them at any particular period, and which may change in less than a generation, but, upon Oneness of Constitution and Oneness of positive Institutions. If the Greek Church is degenerate in the Life of God, (though we do not admit it, except for argument, to the extent that is supposed by those who have never had any intimate association with her members,) it is, so to speak, an accident; owing, chiefly, to her unhappy civil condition, for nearly a thousand years. It is not her normal, or her necessary, state. She has been as vigorous in piety, as fruitful in all the evidences of the divine life, as we can claim to be. Multitudes of her members, at this day, are as earnest in the Faith of Christ, as devout in Worship, as zealous in the Good Works which show a living Faith, as are the holiest and the most active believers among ourselves. There is nothing in her Doctrine, her Worship or her Practice, to prevent this. She has all which made the glowing Devotion of the first ages. It is capable, still, of the same effects. She has all the seeds of the highest and noblest life of Piety. They may germinate again, as they germinated at the beginning. The great Head is with her, according to His promise. She has all with which He originally endowed her. We do not be-

lieve that her spiritual condition is, on the whole, lower than was that of the Church of England, a hundred years ago. She is judged too much by the mass of her people; too little by her standards, and her trained and educated members. Because she has a crowd of poor, illiterate persons, whose Religion, though sincere and earnest, is marred and degraded by numerous superstitions, therefore this, which first strikes the eye of the casual observer, is supposed to be all that there is of her. This judgment is about as just as would be that of a Greek who should say, 'Behold the condition of the American Church! The vast majority of her Baptized are sunk and lost in the world. The Church has no control over them. They do not acknowledge her authority. They do not listen to her voice. They abandon her worship. On the one hand, those who are rich and fashionable, or are seeking gain or power, care nothing for her, despise the restraints of religion, live without the Sacrament, and even without any open acknowledgment of Christ as their Lord; while, on the other hand, there is a herd of low, vicious, ungodly beings, a vast mass of corruption, underlying and threatening to upheave the foundations of Society, who are no better than baptized Infidels:—and, this is American Christianity!'

But, we need not go into this method of apology. It is, really, aside from the true argument which should govern the case. That argument is, Oneness of Constitution, and of Institutions essential to the corporate existence of the Church as a Visible Body. We say, that, in these, the Greek Church lacks nothing; and, that the Protestant Denominations around us lack much. If there is to be Intercommunion, it must be by treaty, as between two Governments; and, the basis of it must be formal and definite Articles of Faith, and Identity in those Institutions, (viz. the Ministry and Sacraments,) without which no Body has a sufficient title to be recognized as a Visible Church, however correct may be the belief of its individual members, or however upright their Christian walk. It is not a question of personal piety, or of individual character: it is not a question between individuals, or mere collections of individuals. It is a question between organized Bodies. The

title to Intercommunion must, therefore, be held by the Bodies *as such*, in their corporate character : and, by this test, the Greek Church is, fully and unquestionably, entitled to Communion with us ; the so-called Evangelical Denominations are not.

The real, practical difficulty which besets the question, in our hands, arises from the fact, that we have made our accidental and temporary position to usurp the place of our true, original and permanent position. We are far more *Protestant* than we are *Catholic* ; we mean, in our spirit and affinities, not in our Prayer Book. Our very name is not a Catholic, but a Denominational, name : " Protestant," as opposed to Rome ; " Episcopal," as distinguished from Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, &c. One would think, that the title chosen by any Branch of the Visible Church of Christ, would express what is essential and permanent in its character, not what is accidental, local and temporary only. Children of the Church of England, we are, if we are anything that gives us a just claim to a place in the Catholic Body, the Church of the United States of America. Yet, this position we have resigned. All that we ask is, (for, it is all that our self-chosen name assumes,) that we be known, and recognized, as one of the Denominations ; namely, The Episcopal Sect opposed to Rome : and, we have our reward ; we *are* so known and recognized. ' Catholic ! ' once wrote a Presbyterian Missionary at Constantinople, in a bitter assault upon our Church, in a pamphlet published in an Oriental language, for the edification of Oriental Christians, ' Catholic ! Why, it is almost the only one of the Denominations in America, which bears the word *Protestant*, in its very name.' And, the name denotes the sentiment which is uppermost in our minds and hearts. We feel a greater nearness to Christians of the Evangelical Sects, than we do to any Branch of the Catholic Church, excepting that from which we sprung. We will go farther, in cultivating good offices with them, in corresponding with them, in associating with them as Religionists, in approaching to Fellowship with them, and, many of us, in actually joining in their religious enterprises than we will go towards a fraternal intercourse with the Greek Church, which is, unquestionably, one with us in the Catholic

Body of Christ. We feel, that it is safe to go farther ; that general opinion in our own Church will bear us out in going farther : and, so it will. Nay, we will have correspondence and intercourse with Sectarians, our Ministers with Sectarian Ministers ; which correspondence and intercourse, leading, perhaps, to united worship in their own Meeting-Houses, are understood, by them, to be correspondence and intercourse with them on an equal footing, Denomination with Denomination. The Union which we encourage them to seek with us, and towards which we, with many fraternal expressions, approach, is a union of co-ordinate Bodies, of Churches, as they understand it. They have no desire to submit to the Church, as having rightful authority over them. They acknowledge no such authority, in her. They would scorn and trample upon the idea. They propose only, (and, we know it, perfectly well,) a union of Denominations, each equal to the others ; a union by compromise, as between Governments having the same rights and powers. And yet, we enter into such negotiations willingly ; and, individuals among us will feel warranted in going much farther in such negotiations, or their preliminaries, than they would venture to go towards Union with the Greek Church :—all which shows the tendency of the main current of common feeling among us. With much labor and sore travail, the whole American Church brings forth a Resolution to inquire about negotiations with the Apostolic Church of the East, one with us, already, in the Visible Body of Christ. The Committee appointed under it, is carefully taught not to venture upon negotiation itself. It is only to *inquire*, and feel towards it. While, on the other hand, individuals, or companies of individuals, including, perhaps, some of those most jealous of any near approach to the Greek Church, will, of their own mind, with no authority from Convention, waiting for no utterance of the Church's wish, rush eagerly into direct and open correspondence and treaty with the prominent representatives of the Sects. It is not our desire, as it is not our business, to sit in judgment upon them. We are only illustrating our argument. We *do* feel much nearer to the Sects, than we do to the Catholic Church.

No one of us questions what, in olden times, was the posi-

tion of the Church towards Schismatical Bodies and their members. St. Cyprian, St. Augustine, and a host of others of the Fathers stand around us, a great cloud of Witnesses on this subject. Those Bodies were not, in any way, recognized by the Church, in their corporate character. To worship with them in their Conventicles was absolutely forbidden. The Church regarded their Members as wanderers from the true Fold. She knew of but one Visible Church ; and, departure from it was disloyalty and Rebellion. Hers was the rightful Government, derived from Christ. She did not so degrade her own prerogative as to treat with Bodies of revolted subjects in arms against her. This would be to recognize them in that very character which constituted their sin : in the character, namely, of Governments, claiming the allegiance of Christians lawfully subject only to the Church, and pretending to hold a position co-ordinate with that of the Church herself, as independent Powers, qualified to treat and negotiate, on equal terms, with the Catholic Communion. Had the Church entered into such negotiations, she would have abandoned her own sovereignty. She did no such thing. Nor did her individual members venture upon so palpable a violation of her Constitution, so open a disregard of her Authority. If *she* could not treat with Rebels, much less could any of her sons. It were treason to her to attempt it. She stood ready, always, to receive her erring children returning to her bosom. They knew her Laws, her Faith, her Discipline ; or, she was willing to teach them, if they would come to her. She *did* teach them, by faithful warnings and arguments against their course ; affectionately calling them back to their allegiance ; plainly declaring to them the sin of their Schism. But, she did not go, we cannot discover an instance in which any one of her Pastors went, to mingle in worship, even her own worship, with them, in Places of Assembly whose very existence was rebellion against her laws. How could she do it, without, at least, seeming to recognize them in their Schismatical character ? Her doors were open. They were her children, by the Law of their Baptism ; for, every Baptism, by whomsoever administered, if valid, was, of necessity, and from the very nature and essential

efficacy of the Sacrament, Baptism into the Body of Christ, which is His Church. We do not deny, that individuals were sought out, and brought back from their error, into her Communion; but, never do we see processes of negotiation with the Schismatical Bodies themselves, or with their Leaders as representing them. This could not be done, without changing the truth of the relation between the Church and the Sects. It can no more be done now than then. It would not be thought of, if we realized the truth of our position as the Catholic Church of America. That it *is* thought of, talked of, and even attempted, shows, that we do not realize that truth. Our mental vision, so clear and accurate when we speak and act with reference to our civil Government and its rebellious subjects, seems, all at once, obscured, or distorted, when we contemplate the relations of the Church of Christ. No one of us would dare to do, under our National allegiance, what many of us feel free to do, under our Ecclesiastical subjection. And yet, the principles of Government which hold in the one case, are equally applicable in the other; and that because the Authority, in both cases, is a divine gift, the Authority of Church and State.

That any good can come from violating those principles, seems to us impossible. Compromise, expediency may rule the hour; but, they cannot save us from the fearful consequences of setting aside immutable Laws. It is the crying of Peace, Peace, where, in the end, there will be no Peace. It is the relinquishing of the claim by which the Church can alone maintain her position as the Visible Church of Christ. Plausible arguments of charity and conciliation may be advanced in defense of it; but, its effect is to surrender the rightful dominion of the Church, to subject the Faith once delivered to the Saints and her Apostolic Ministry, to the chances of negotiation and compromise. It is, in effect, to make of her a Sect. She no longer stands, claiming the allegiance of all men to her Divine Belief and her Divine Government, as being both of God; but, she enters into conference with those who deny the one, and reject the other, as if they had equal rights in their Error with her in her Truth. This must bring both her

Faith and her Authority into utter contempt.—But, our desire is not to discuss the passing phases of the times. It was important to our argument to show, that the common feeling among us is unfavorable to our boldly taking, and firmly holding, the position of the Catholic Church.

And here, we say, is our great, our radical difficulty, in approaching the Greek Church. It is the one obstacle above all others, in the way of restoring the ancient Communion. There are difficulties on the other side, difficulties of prejudice, and greater difficulties of ignorance. The separation of so many centuries has made us utter strangers. We have seldom met a Greek Bishop who knew of the existence of the Anglican Church, apart from the common mass of Protestants. We will venture to say, that, when our Mission started in Constantinople, nine out of ten of the Greeks in Turkey believed the English to be Infidels. Romanism and Protestantism are, to an Oriental, the only known Religions of the West ; and, the latter is, in his conception, represented by an irreligious horde of Schismatics, who have broken off from the Roman Church, and are living without a settled Faith, without a regular Ministry, and without valid Sacraments. To eradicate these misconceptions, must be the work of time. But, they can be, easily and speedily, banished from the minds of those who are in authority. We can testify, from experience, to the joy and gladness with which a Greek Bishop hears, for the first time, of the existence of the Anglican Communion. A Church in the West, not subject to Rome, and yet exhibiting all the credentials of Catholicity, relieves him, at once, from that sense of loneliness which he feels when he imagines, that the Church of Christ has no true Representative beyond his own Communion. It gives him strength and confidence, in the long and wearisome warfare with Rome which he has inherited. Depressed by civil and social tyranny, the energies of his Church weakened by the evil influences under which she lives, while the Church of Rome, free, powerful and active in herself, and aided by some of the strongest Governments of earth, is putting forth unceasing efforts to overturn the foundations of ecclesiastical independence in the East,—it is like life

from the dead to him, to hear of another, a numerous, and an able Body in the West, to which he may look for succor and defense, an army waging the same warfare with his own. We believe, therefore, that the presentation of our Church in her Catholic character will be hailed with joy and welcome. But, ignorance magnifies the importance of little things ; and, Superstition gives to its Idol the qualities of essential Truth. The masses of the Greeks are ignorant and superstitious. Many of the Clergy are not far removed from the same condition. Some things which they need most to be relieved of they would most reluctantly resign ; while the want of so simple and unimportant a thing as the common use of the sign of the Cross, would, at first sight, make us appear, in their eyes, almost as unbelievers. To *them*, it is the token of Christianity, in distinction from Mohammedanism, which denies, that Jesus died upon the Cross, and, therefore, hates this particular Symbol most especially. A Christian, and not use the sign of the Cross ! It is to the Greeks something worse than foolishness ; it is next to the denial of the Faith itself. We mention this, only as an instance to illustrate the prejudice that an illiterate Greek might feel against us, on low and unworthy grounds. We do not anticipate, however, that this spirit would appear, to any injurious extent, among the higher Clergy ; and, therefore, it might not, probably would not, effectually hinder the progress of Intercommunion. Its existence strikes us as another reason, one of prudence and wisdom, for confining the question ourselves, and insisting that our Greek Brethren confine it, to those points which present the fundamental and positive conditions of Catholic Unity. With this restriction, we do not see anything to prevent the restoration of active Fellowship ; it being always understood, that the Creed resume the form in which it issued from the First Council of Constantinople.

ART. II.—THE TWO THEORIES OF CIVILIZATION.

CHRISTIANITY VERSUS HUMANITARIANISM.

History of Civilization in England. By HENRY THOMAS BUCKLE. Two Volumes. New York : D. Appleton & Co. 1861.

Protestantism and Catholicity Compared in their Effects on the Civilization of Europe. By REV. J. BALMES. Baltimore, 1857.

THERE are two theories of Life, of Social Progress, of Civilization, which are now struggling for the mastery, and which we propose briefly to notice. They are not always formally stated, and technically and authoritatively pronounced before the public, yet the elements of those two theories exist, and are actively at work ; and they are of necessity antagonistic the one to the other. If the one is true, the other must be false. If the one is the condition of all true social prosperity, to the other is attached, as the inevitable consequent, ultimate ruin ; and this as it regards the highest forms of Civilization, and the noblest destinies of the Human Race.

We have placed at the head of this Article, the Caption "Christianity versus Humanitarianism" not because the two terms are antagonistic to each other. On the contrary, a living Christianity is the highest type of Humanitarianism. Christianity has received no deadlier blow than in the conception and treatment of it as something distinct from the beings whom it came to bless and ennoble. Precisely here, was one of the great mistakes of the Continental Reformation. Christianity was regarded not as a Life, but as a System of Metaphysical Dogmas ; and so the dry bones of that System were wired together into a hideous skeleton, which frowned like a grim tyrant upon all the warm instincts and gushing sympathies of the human heart. See, for example, the Orthodox Formularies of New England Calvinism, of a half a Century ago, grim as Moloch,

—"horrid king, besmeared with blood,
Of human sacrifice, and parents' tears,"

bristling all over with Divine Sovereignty ; and then study the writings of such a man as the elder Channing, responding in the kindest tones to every echo of want and suffering ; pleading, in persuasive accents, for the love of the Beautiful and the True ; cultivating assiduously and earnestly, the humanities and sweet charities of human life. If the one was more orthodox, the other was more amiable and lovely ; and, thoughtful men so decided. We have placed these terms in this juxtaposition, as representing and expressing the idea of the two hostile forces of which we are to treat. The final victory of the one over the other, is the great problem to be solved in the history of our world ; it is the dark enigma of centuries, yet to be made plain. In writing now, we write as Christian men. We believe in Christianity. We have faith in it. What we now propose is, to present, as clearly as we may, one of those antagonistic powers, and to hold it up before such as may give us their attention, as the object of their truest confidence. The age and times in which we live demand such an exposition.

Christ the Life, Christ the Alone Source of all true growth and progress, this is our theme. There is a frequency and intensity of expression on this point in the later New Testament writings, which is significant. "He giveth Life unto the world." (John vi. 33.) "He that hath the Son hath Life, and he that hath not the Son hath not Life." (I John v. 12.) These are specimens of the method of expressing this great truth. We may add, that Jesus Christ is also the Way and the Truth ; which two relations towards man are equally fundamental as that which we are now to consider. But of these we do not now speak.

In what respects is Christ the Life ? He is the Fountain, the ever abiding source of all inanimate and animate Life. To what extent the curse first pronounced upon our world affected the Laws of the material creation, is a matter of conjecture. But that they were affected, is clearly revealed. "Cursed is the ground for thy sake." "Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee." To the extent in which the natural and inanimate world shared in the curse pronounced for man's sake,

to that same extent may Nature sympathize in the blessings of her Risen Lord. And so, too, of the higher forms of animated Life ; that principle or power which, clothed with the dust of the earth as its outward form, gives to that form beauty, and grace, and power. In this sense, Christ is the Life ; for, "all things were created by Him and for Him," and "by Him all things consist." (Col. i. 16 and 17.) As we look out upon the material world, and see the operations of that mysterious principle which we call Life, which vivifies and causes to grow, every blade of grass, and plant, and shrub, and tree, we behold the power, not of some fortuitous combination of outward circumstances, not of some Law of Nature, so called, as having vitality within itself, for the Law of Nature is but the uniformity of method of a Higher Power, but we trace the workings of the Life of Christ. It is a delightful thought that, in that world of beauty which stretches out above us, and around us, by day and by night, and in that world of music of ten-thousand voices which floats upon the air and falls upon the ear from the whole field of animate and inanimate Nature, we behold the handiwork, and listen to the melody of Him Who, in this lowest sense, is the Life of the world.

Christ is the Life of Man's Intellectual and Moral Nature. Man was the crowning act of the Creation. When God had made all things else, He takes counsel of Himself, as if about to enter on some nobler work. "Let us make Man in Our image." That image was intellectual and moral. Even amid the ruins of the Fall, and the ill-balanced developments of man's nature, working out of the divine plan, and harmony, and order, weakened by undue subjection to his lower propensities, we see something of the nobility with which he was at the first endowed. Behold, for example, the conceptions and triumphs of Genius,—breathing upon the canvas, and in the marble ; or embodied in those massive structures which are the wonder and admiration of the world ; or, which live from age to age in the pages of poetry and song. Or, see what human learning has done in all its various departments ; see, the triumphs of skill and enterprise ; see, what even one master mind has accomplished, fired by the impulse of its own vaulting ambition

—in all this, we catch a glimpse of what that intellectual life must have been, as it came forth fresh and “very good” from its Author. And yet, in all this, we see the outworkings of the Life of Christ.

As we approach to look upon man as reflecting the Moral image of God, we reach the highest sense in which Christ is the Life, and the source of all true Progress. We look upon the Second Person of the Trinity, the Son of God, in a new attitude, as the Son of Man, THE CHRIST, the Deliverer, the Life-Giver, for so in the vernacular of the Apostles, the word Saviour signifies.* Man in his apostasy lost that image. To the body there came, as a consequence and penalty, disease and death. Christ brought Life and immortality to the body. Beside the opened grave, He bids His Ministers say, “I am the Resurrection and the Life.” “As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive.” He brought Life to the Soul. The soul was disordered in its noblest powers; its will perverted; its affections estranged; its aspirations debased to inferior and unworthy objects. In Christ, the soul finds strength in its weakness, righteousness in its sinfulness, and Redemption from the penalty which it had incurred. The gates of Paradise once closed are reopened, and the offer of return to the fellowship of the Father, and the fruition of His favor, is made, free as the mountain air and the dews of Heaven. It forms an argument with the Apostle to the Gentiles to show, that,

“In Him the tribes of Adam boast
More blessings than their Father lost.”

There is still another sense in which Christ is the Fountain of Life. We mean, the Organic Life of Society; the Life, not of a man as an individual, but of Man as a social being. We speak now of Man, in the Family, the State, the Church; the three great organisms of God's creation, and of man's necessity. Of this organic Life, Christ is the Fountain. If, “in Him was Life,” and if “He giveth Life unto the world,” it needs not an argument to prove that that Life reaches these the highest of all man's organic relations. It is seen and felt more and more

* See Murdock's translation of Syriac New Testament. Preface, p. vii.

with the growth of an intelligent child-like piety in the Church, that the wonderful mysterious depth of meaning in the Prophetic and Messianic Psalms of David, can have its only full interpretation, as it sets forth Jesus Christ as the Life and Light of the whole world, and especially in these the necessary conditions of Human Society.

We come now to another enquiry, as to the method of bestowment or communication of that Life. And here we note a general principle, which prevails everywhere, be the order of Life what it may. The bestowal and perpetuation of Life, are in accordance with a certain Law of Means and Ends. It is so in the lowest form of Life, in the inanimate world. God might, if it had pleased Him, have ordained a different rule. He might have clothed the hills and valleys by perpetual miracle. But He chose to bind the perpetuation of that Life to a certain Law of instrumentalities. The first communication of that Life was immediate and miraculous; the perpetuation of that Life is mediate, and through the use of appointed of means.

So it is with the highest orders of that Life; the Moral Life of Man, and the Organic Life of Society. What all the Laws of that Life are, in all these social relations, is a great question. It is one which it would be impossible to answer to the satisfaction even of all Christian readers. The organic Life of the State, for example; what the normal conditions of that Life are, and especially in its relations to Christ; what the true exponents and representations of that relation are, is a question upon which even the wisest Christian Statesmen disagree. Such men as Hildebrand, and Pius IX, hold one theory; and the Christian representative of American Democracy holds another. Yet all unite, in affirming the Fact of the relation, and all may agree that that relation shall be recognized; and that, too, in the observance of those positive appointments which pertain to the specific duties of the State. And all, it may be, will learn, by-and-by, that the State best subserves its own well-being, by not trenching upon functions which do not lie within its sphere; that it shall respect other divinely ordained Laws of Life; and that it shall observe its own.

The Law of that Life, as pertaining to the Church, is not subject to this uncertainty. Supernatural, specially devised and instituted, to meet a great emergency, and to accomplish that where Naturalism had failed, this System has a Law, an Economy of Life of its own. What that Law, that Economy is, is not a matter of Reason or Speculation ; is not to be learned by assumed analogies between "Christianity and the Religion of Nature," as a New England preacher and Professor has recently maintained ;* and Count de Maistre had maintained essentially the same thing ; but from the positive enactments and Institutions in which this Supernatural System is set forth. We refer of course here, not to the Ethics, but to the Mysteries of Christianity. We have no right to detract from that System. We have no right to add to that System. We have no right to regard that System as incomplete, inchoate, existing in a germinant state, and to be brought to perfection by our fancied wisdom. Here is the root of the errors in the multiform Sectism which is all about us. We can no more change the Law of Life in the Supernatural, than in the Natural world. The connection of Means with Ends is a part of that Law. Christ established His Mystical Body, His Church, that, through that Body, we might have membership in Him Who is the Head ; and so have grace and strength for the work to which He calls us. He has connected Form and Life, Body and Soul. Experience has shown that Life without Form, Soul without Body, might, perhaps, do for angels, but will never do for men. Men ainting at a truer, purer Life, have again and again tried the experiment of Life without Form ; they are trying it to-day. The result has always been, that they have lost the Form and the Life together. This is the Law of Life. The Church, Christ's Body, is not a heartless mechanism ; not a mere system of dry abstract doctrine ; not a Voluntary Society ; not a piece of cold marble statuary, beautiful to the eye but motionless as death. Seen by faith, and as it once was, and will be again, the Church is a living Bódy ; a warm

* See Peabody's Lectures before the Lowell Institute, on "Christianity the Religion of Nature." Boston: Gould & Lincoln; 1864.

heart beats within it, sending forth its living pulsations through all its living members ; that heart the heart of Christ ; the ever abiding presence and power of the Holy Ghost.

Here we see the position which the Sacraments occupy in this System. They are God's appointed instrumentalities, by which the Life of Christ is given. We have membership in the Body, that we may by the Spirit, have Life from Him Who is the Head. Baptism is not a mere outward Sign. The Sacrament of His Body and Blood is not a mere memorial. Its virtue is not, in that it awakens sacred memories and high anticipations. Coming to that Holy Supper with penitence, and faith, and charity, we feed on Christ by faith, and our Souls are refreshed "by the Body and Blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the Bread and Wine." There are also the other public and private Means of Grace. This is the Law of Life in Christ, as pertaining to that organic Visible Institution, the Church of Christ.

We stated in the commencement of this Article that there are two theories of Civilization, of the well-being and progress of Society, now before the public mind. They are opposite theories. They start from different bases. They take for granted entirely different views as to the facts in the case, and the work to be done. They cannot both be true. One of them is the Christian theory, the other is the Humanitarian theory. One, rests its main reliance for the regeneration of Society on a System of Supernaturalism, and claims that such a System already exists. The other, denies both the necessity and the existence of such a System, and relies on some Scheme of Naturalism as adequate to the necessities of Society. We do not say that these two theories are always formally announced, and clearly and sharply defined ; but we do say that around the one or the other of these theories, all modern schemes of Civilization may be grouped.

The ablest defender of the Humanitarian theory is the late Mr. Buckle. He lays down the following four propositions as his basis of the History of Civilization :—

"1st. That the progress of mankind depends on the success with which the laws of phenomena are investigated, and on the extent to

which a knowledge of those laws is diffused. 2d. That before such investigation can begin, a spirit of skepticism must arise, which, at first aiding the investigation, is afterward aided by it. 3d. That the discoveries thus made, increase the influence of intellectual truths, and diminish, relatively, not absolutely, the influence of moral truths; moral truths being more stationary than intellectual truths, and receiving fewer additions. 4th. That the great enemy of this movement, and therefore the great enemy of civilization, is the protective spirit; by which I mean the notion that society cannot prosper unless the affairs of life are watched over and protected at nearly every turn by the state and the church; the state teaching men what to do, and the church teaching them what they are to believe.”*

And yet in the course of his second volume, and the last which he wrote, there is betrayed the evident consciousness of some mistake in his calculations, some unknown factor in the problem which he had set himself to solve. He says,—

“To solve the great problem of affairs; to detect those hidden circumstances which determine the march and destiny of nations; and to find, in the events of the past, a key to the proceedings of the future, is nothing less than to unite into a single science all the laws of the moral and physical world. * * * Once, when I first caught sight of the whole field of knowledge, and seemed, however dimly, to discern its various parts, and the relation they bore to each other, I was so entranced with its surpassing beauty, that the judgment was beguiled, and I deemed myself able, not only to cover the surface, but also to master the details. Little did I know how the horizon enlarges as well as recedes, and how vainly we grasp at the fleeting forms, which melt away and elude us in the distance. Of all that I had hoped to do, I now find but too surely how small a part I shall accomplish. In those early aspirations, there was much that was fanciful; perhaps there was much that was foolish. Perhaps, too, they contained a moral defect, and savored of an arrogance which belongs to a strength that refuses to recognize its own weakness. * * * It is painful to make this confession; but I owe it to the reader, because I would not have him to suppose that either in this or in the future volumes of my History I shall be able to redeem my pledge, and to perform all that I promised.”†

In our own country we trace the popular exhibition of this Humanitarian theory, in various forms. We see it in the Literature and Theology, which flow so abundantly from the New England press and pulpit, and of which the *Atlantic Monthly*, and other current periodicals, are full to overflowing. These teachers tell us, that Man has the fountain of Life within him—

* History of Civilization. Vol II. p. 1. † History of Civilization. pp. 257-8.

self ; that he is, in and of himself, equal to all the exigencies of his being ; his own Prophet, his own Priest, his own King. The Oracle within, the Human Consciousness, the Spiritual Instinct, this is the Throne of Majesty, the Voice of God, (if there be a personal God,) which men are bid to approach with awful reverence; and fall down and adore. This is the New Evangel of the Nineteenth Century, which is to usher in a new era of Human Progress ! Did it never occur to these men, how many questions there are, which come rushing upon the heart unbidden, pressing for an answer, which this New Evangel does not answer ? The consciousness of sin ! the fearful apprehensions of the future ! the yearnings for Communion with God ! Can it silence thoughts like these ? As we stand around the opened graves of our friends, or look forward into our own, has it words to satisfy us ? Has it ever soothed and cheered the heart, amid these great realities of human life ? Its wretched wit, its quiet jeers, its transcendental dreams, are mockery to the Soul at such an hour.

Sometimes, this Humanitarian theory takes a more practical shape. It looks out upon Society, and it sees a legion of evils, inequality, suffering, poverty and crime. It sees and feels the want of a principle of Life. It comes to the conclusion, that man is too isolated ; that these little Family groups must be broken up ; that lust and impure desire shall be rendered impossible by promiscuous license ; and that the inequalities of Property which cluster around the individual and the Family relation, shall be levelled before the rule of a common purse. Such Associations have assumed various forms, and shapes, and names, in this country, within the last few years ; and the American disciples of Proudhon, and Fourier, and St. Simon, and Louis Blanc, have had their Phalansteries at New Harmony, Ind., and Hopedale, and Roxbury, and Northampton in Mass., and in Connecticut, and New Jersey ; and even men like Hawthorne and others, more or less distinguished in the walks of literature, have identified themselves with these institutions, and tried the new experiment. And yet under the power of the inherently vicious principle on which all these Associations have been based, the airy bubble has always ex-

ploded, and still the cry is raised,—Who will show us any good ?

There is abroad, another theory of Life, directly the opposite to those which we have mentioned ; opposite in name, and in pretension, opposite in the public estimation, and yet scarcely less Humanitarian than they ; and, with every new development in the System, becoming more closely identified with them. The kindly feeling and sympathy which not infrequently are exhibited between extreme Ultra-Montanists and Humanitarians, seem at first, paradoxical ; in reality it is not so ; they spring from a real unity of principle which is the basis of that sympathy. This System has its theory of Life. But it puts the Church in the place of Christ. It mistakes Means for Causes, the Channel for the Fountain. And so, the Church, and the Priesthood, and the Sacraments, and the Dogmas, instead of leading the soul to Christ, the only Life, and Fountain of Life, are made themselves to be the Life. Christ, the Life and the Light, is hidden from view by these humanly erected barriers, and under their shadow man stumbles in darkness. We have named here the very essence and spirit of Popery ; and we point to every land where the System has had undisputed sway, to Central and Southern America, for example, in proof that its Theory of Life has proved a signal and universal failure.

The work of Balmes, which we have placed at the head of this Article, is perhaps the most popular defense of the Romish religion, in its influence on Civilization, which has appeared in modern times. Yet it is thoroughly untruthful to history in many of its statements, and utterly impotent in its reasonings and conclusions. The Protestantism which the writer assails, is of the most ultra type, such as nobody accepts ; the "Catholicity" which he defends, is such as we might look for from a cloistered clever young devotee, fresh from the mystic pages of Thomas a Kempis, and the *Summa* of the "Angelic Doctor." It is not the "Catholicity" of Trent, nor of multitudes of its most learned Doctors, nor such as the world sees it. It is *exoteric* "Catholicity," the "Catholicity" of the uninitiated. The work, in so far as it exhibits fairly the influence of Chris-

tianity on European Civilization, might have been written much more effectively by an American or English Churchman ; for they know what a true Catholicity is ; they both appreciate that individuality of thought and character which is indispensable to all true and manly culture ; and yet, they both are taught the lesson of reverence and submission to authority, which rescues freedom from licentiousness. Precisely here, is the difference between the System of the Church, and Ultra-Protestantism on the one hand, and Romanism on the other. The one of these Systems deifies the individual, and annihilates authority, order, Law ; the other, sacrifices the individual in a blind submission. Both are hostile to the development of a true Civilization. Romanism can only hold its own, in this country, by keeping up the most rigid system of *Caste*, and by shutting out an open Bible from the hearts and consciences of its people. It gains, if it gains at all, only by decoying into its fold, those who boast of being free from the fetters of Creeds, of having got rid of such things as prejudice and bigotry, and of believing everything in general, and nothing in particular. These persons, in this artificial and corrupt age, it sometimes wins, by its gaudy display of sensuous ceremonialism, occasionally by its highly artistic and æsthetic worship, by its loud pretensions, and by its cunning, and too often truthful delineations of the fruits of Ultra-Protestantism. Nor is this theory of Life confined altogether to the System of Romanism. It may be found, and such is the weakness of human nature, it sometimes is found, among the adherents of the baldest Quakerism, as well as among the devotees of the most elaborate ceremonialism.

We have now stated the two Theories of Life, of Progress, of Civilization, briefly, yet we hope distinctly and clearly. We have only used arguments enough to show that our statements are not groundless ; and illustrations enough to make our meaning intelligible. We have aimed at a definite statement of a great principle, to which, in a day of latitudinarian indefiniteness, when the old land-marks are being swept away, the Christian consciousness of every Churchman will respond, and on which it may fasten. A full defense of our main position,

and a full illustration gathered from the history of the past, would be a complete reply to the bold and pretentious work of Mr. Buckle, and to the schemes of our Infidel Socialists on the one hand, and to the theories of Balmes and Montalembert in their defense of the Romish Religion on the other. A clear perception and a firm grasp of the great principle which we have presented, once attained, and these specious defenses of Error are answered, in full and at once. The difference between us and them, is vital and fundamental, and can never be reconciled by any examination of this or that particular fact in Civil History. An examination of any one of the Chapters of Buckle, and the same remark is in part true of the work of Balmes, would, after all, be only a petty wrangling upon details. We might expose sophistries, we might refute assertions, we might explain facts, we might present insurmountable difficulties, which these writers have strangely ignored. But what then? We have not silenced them. We have only driven them from one theory, and quibble, and line of defense, to another. We differ, in the first, great, fundamental principle, from which we start; and that difference covers and characterizes the whole field of observation. We hold to one Theory of Life, the Life of the world; they hold to another. They are driven, by the very necessity of their position, to reconcile Theory and Fact; that Theory is one which follows naturally and inevitably from their disbelief and rejection of the Gospel and Grace of God, as we believe it to have been given. We may however answer a gainsayer; and this work must be done over and over again, until there shall no longer be any need to contend for the Faith once delivered to the Saints.

In conclusion, we present a single consideration to Churchmen, as suited to the present condition of the Church in our own day and nation. This theory of Life has its lesson for us. Churchmen are casting around in these times to learn the great secret of Church extension and progress. The question has come up, and will come up again, in our General and Diocesan Conventions. It is a great question. It is a legitimate question. It is a question, which men thoroughly in earnest, will not be kept back from raising. In the present abnormal con-

dition of the Church, so unprimitive in her arrangements, so unfitted to grapple resolutely with the necessities of her position, and do her great work alike in our large towns and cities, and on our frontiers, at a time and in a nation such as ours, the question of Primitive Bishops, and Primitive Dioceses, and Primitive Deacons and Deaconesses, and Primitive methods, ought to, and will be, asked and met. But let us never forget, that even these are not all. Nay, let us remember, that we may have them every one, and yet in vain. What the Church needs most of all, is the Life of Christ, a living Christianity; Christianity, not in the abstract, and as a dogma, but in the concrete, and as a living principle of action; not, as a splendid pageantry, and an artistic display, but a Christianity which goes out into the world, in self-denial, and poverty, and shame, if need be, to seek and to save that which is lost.

How to obtain more of the power of that Life of Christ in the Church, is the great question of all questions. It is the question of our times. A Ministry thoroughly imbued with such a spirit; young men thronging to our Seminaries, thirsting not for place, and ease, and position, but to follow the Blessed Saviour's lowly footsteps, as He went about doing good; Laymen, and Laywomen, craving no nobler work than to lay their choicest offerings, of personal influence, of money, of time, and of labor, on the Altar of their Blessed Lord and Saviour—tell us how to gain these, and the question is answered how to gain all things else. One thing is certain. The appointed conditions of that Life, whatever they may be, must be observed. If Prayer is one, then the Church must have more Prayer. And if Liturgic Prayer is the proper method of Prayer, as Ministers of all shades of Churchmanship are now insisting so earnestly, and if our own Liturgy is so complete in its provisions for all the wants of our Congregations, as is so eloquently maintained, then let us try that method, as it never, in our Branch of the Church, has been tried before. If the "Hudson Street Daily Prayer Meeting" is really not the very best thing for us, let us show that we think so by our own consistent practice. If Sacraments are a condition of that Life, let the due reception of the Sacraments have its place.

In one word, if Christ be, in deed and in truth, the Life of the Church, and we believe that He is, let us seek and let us gain that Life. Such a Church will prosper. Such a Church will save the Nation, and save the world. Such a Church will have within itself all the elements and conditions of social progress and high Civilization. The Psalmist's prayer will be answered; "that Thy Way may be known upon Earth, Thy saving health among all Nations;" and "Then shall the Earth bring forth her increase, and God, even our own God shall give us His blessing." Here, and here alone, is the "salt of the Earth," the "leaven" of all National prosperity.

On the contrary, extinguish the Life of Christ in our own Nation, that Life which is the Light of the world, blot out His Church, and Word, and Worship, and Sabbaths, and Works of Charity, and kindle in their stead, the beacon lights of man's devising, and there is a Fountain opened, but not of Life, a Fountain of Blood and of Death; and by that Light men shall stumble at noon-day as in the night. Once, not long ago, this experiment was fairly and fully tried. Christianity, in name at least, was trampled in the dust. "Down with the wretch," was the horrid execration hurled at the Name and Cause of Jesus of Nazareth. Romish corruptions had disgusted, and Romish craft and cruelty had inflamed to madness, not only the thinking men but the masses of the people.* Infidelity triumphed; the Goddess of Reason was enthroned on the ruins of Christianity; and on Christ's Altars were celebrated Rites the most blasphemous and impure. There stood forth Humanitarianism, the *beau ideal* of our modern philosophers and reformers, panoplied with art, and genius, and influence, and power, clothed with every facility, for a fair trial of what it could do. What was the result? The historian tells us, that the reign of Humanitarianism in France was a reign of terror; that proscription followed proscription, and tragedy followed tragedy, until the Nation was converted into a horde of assassins. All social ties were rent asunder. The distinctions of

* Both Voltaire and Renan were trained and designed for the Romish Church. Their hatred of what they were educated to regard as Christianity, is not a cause of surprise. The same process is going on in our own country.

Right and Wrong were confounded. Cruelties unheard of were perpetrated. Her rivers were stained with the blood and choked with the bodies of the slain ; until it seemed as if the knell of the whole nation was tolled, and the world was summoned to its execution and funeral. Within a little space, three millions of souls were offered on the bloody Altar of Humanitarianism.

Let the men in our own country, and in these our own times, writers, lecturers, statesmen, philosophers, poets, whoever and whatever they may be called, who suffer no opportunity to pass by unimproved to stab the Cause of Christ, and sneer at the Church, and laugh at Creeds, and who at the same time, instil into the minds and confidence of the people, their own Godless theories, (and our modern literature, which comes into all our parlors, and fascinates and beguiles the minds of the young, is full of such deadly poison), let them, we say, one and all, gaze upon this picture until they are satisfied. Like causes will produce like results everywhere.

We close, as we began, by saying, that there are abroad two Theories of Life, of Social Progress, of Civilization, which are now struggling for the mastery.

ART. III.—POSITIVISM.

1. *A History of the Intellectual Development of Europe.* By JOHN WILLIAM DRAPER, M. D., LL. D., Professor of Chemistry and Physiology in the University of New York: Harper & Brothers. 1863.
2. *History of Civilization in England.* By HENRY THOMAS BUCKLE.
3. *The Biographical History of Philosophy, from its origin in Greece down to the present day.* By GEORGE HENRY LEWES. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1859.

FARRAR, in his History of Free thought, states that the Positive Philosophy of M. Auguste Comtè is the extreme form of Anti-Christian speculation in Europe, the various Schools of unbelief shading down from that Atheistic darkness to the refined sentimentalism of Newman and Renan. It was to be expected that the first named philosophy would find disciples and advocates in America. Accordingly, the work placed at the head of our Article, with several professions of a different and more genial Faith on the part of the author, is a learned and laborious compilation upon the basis of that Philosophy. The adoption of such a basis is the more remarkable and decided, because the work professes to be an account of the "*Intellectual Development of Europe.*" The very conception of the book, referring the intellectual development of Europe to a mere Physical Law, is the most exaggerated application of the system of M. Comtè.

It is usual for writers of this class to put forth the most earnest remonstrances against the right of any one to bring moral or religious considerations to bear upon their speculations. They make themselves the champions of the largest liberty, and piteously complain of the persecutions which Science and free inquiry have endured from Religion and the Church.

In regard to the first position, it is unquestionably the duty of every man, who believes that the foundations of Religion or Morality will be undermined by any new System or alledged discovery, to oppose the novelty, with all the force of argument and reason that he can command. And no reason or argument can be more legitimate than the proof that the new doctrine does undermine the foundations of Religion or Morality: for it is the method of true Science to compare truths together, and to test the unknown by the known. In that way only can Truth be established. The honest and rigid application of that method, will presently determine whether the new doctrine is true or false. If it is true, then the alleged contradiction to a previously known truth will be shown not to exist. The contradiction was only in the mistaken conceptions of the opponent. This has been the legitimate history of all disputed opinions, which have ultimately worked their way into acceptance as truths.

The attempt to excite prejudice against Religion and the Church, by the cry of persecution, proceeds upon an utter misconception of the facts. Christianity and the Church cannot persecute, without falsifying all the principles of their own foundation. When fanatical and wicked rulers in the Church have been clothed with secular power, they have often violated the teachings of Christianity by persecution, but this only as they outraged the principles of their Religion by other deeds of wickedness. Persecution is one expression of that evil heart of man which the Christian Religion tries to change and improve. If the men engaged in these occurrences had been reversed in position in regard to temporal power, the same unseemly exhibition of unhallowed temper would probably have been made. Certainly, in these days, the only form of persecution allowed, vituperation and insult, is visited, in abundant measure, upon Religion and the Church.*

* A practical demonstration of this principle was given the other day in the United States Senate. There, one of the largest-liberty men, a champion of Infidel radicalism, from Mass., attempted to procure the *expulsion* of a Senator, for no other offense than the offering a series of Resolutions, impugning, by an array of cogent facts, the infallibility and purity of the Administration!

We do not intend to bring any moral or religious considerations to bear upon the works named at the head of this Article, however legitimate that mode of argument may be. But we do propose to examine the fundamental principles which belong to them all, and to the class of books which they represent, by their own favorite test, Positive Science. An American Quarterly will be expected to pay most attention to the American writer.

Dr. Draper's book is a pretty fair specimen of that phase of Modern Science which is bitterly hostile to Christianity. The argument is a studied, or, it may be, an unconscious confusion of the merest truisms, with the most pernicious falsehoods. And, while the truths are proved by a wearisome surplusage of evidence, the falsehoods are quietly assumed to be incontrovertibly established by the same evidence. This peculiarity is, as far as our reading extends, the characteristic of the whole swarm of books and Essays, from that class of Physical inquirers who fancy that the accumulation of a large amount of facts, in the field of Physical Science, qualifies them to pronounce, *ex cathedra*, upon the most profound problems of morals and religion. The source of this hallucination seems to be, that these gentlemen have learned so much, that they complacently take it for granted, that there is nothing else to learn. Having traversed, with laborious diligence, the whole circle of Natural Science, and feeling a very pardonable self-gratulation at this achievement, they forget that there is another large department of human knowledge, not included in their curriculum; and they forthwith proceed, with an air of philosophic precision and comprehensiveness, to classify the more obvious phenomena of that unexplored department, under some one or more of the Sciences which have monopolized their attention. Thus our author, who had previously published a very creditable work on Physiology, gravely announces the subject of the present work to be, to prove that all the phenomena of human life, character, and history, and all human relations, are the passive subjects of physiological law. The following are some of the passages in which this object of the work is set forth:—

"The equilibrium and movement of humanity, are altogether physiological phenomena." Page 2.

"Social advancement is as completely under the control of natural law, as is *bodily* growth. The life of an individual is a miniature of the life of a nation. These propositions it is the special object of this book to demonstrate."

"No one, I believe, has hitherto undertaken the labor of arranging the evidence offered by the intellectual history of Europe, in accordance with physiological principles, so as to illustrate the orderly progress of civilization." * * * "Seen thus, through the medium of physiology, history presents a new aspect to us." Preface.

"The production, continuance and death, of an organic molecule in the person, answers to the production, continuance and death of a person in the nation. Nutrition and decay, in one case, are equivalent to well-being and transformation in the other." Page 11.

If the author had simply put forth this astounding proposition, and then applied himself to the proof of it, the book would have been very harmless, for then, every one would have seen that the formidable array of facts, offered as evidence, had little or no connection with the thesis to be maintained. But he adroitly disguises this professed object of the work under a more general, and a very different proposition, which he thus announces:—

"The government of the world is accomplished by immutable law. Such a conception commends itself to the intellect of man, by its majestic grandeur. It makes him discern the external, through the vanishing of present events, and through the shadows of time. From the life, the pleasures, the sufferings of humanity, it points to the impulsive; from our wishes, wants, and woes, to the inexorable." * * * "It is of law that I am to speak in this book. In a world composed of vanquishing forms, I am to vindicate the imperishability, the majesty of law, and to show how man proceeds, in his social march, in obedience to it." Pages 15, 16.

These are stately words, announcing a truth so universally acknowledged, that it may well be called a truism. And it is to the establishment of this truism, that all the illustrative evidence from the Physical Sciences is brought. The proof was unnecessary, as the proposition was undisputed. Unquestionably, the Universe is governed by LAW, and therefore, says Common Sense—the highest philosophy of all—by a LAW GIVER.

The discovery and annunciation of special laws, is the business and glory of true Science. But, whether a particular law

be known or unknown, has nothing at all to do with the indisputable decision of Common Sense—the authentic voice of humanity—that a law presupposes a Law Maker, by whom the law was given, and by whom it may be controlled. But our physical philosopher has a very different idea of law. Despising the vulgar logic which sees that in the idea of Law is included that of the Law Giver, he discourses of “resistless law” as an *entity*, independent of a Law Giver, and describes this law as the true and only source of being. This pervading characteristic of the whole work is contained, very plainly, in the following passage:

“There is thus an aspect of homogeneousness in the structure of all systems in the universe, which, though some have spoken of it as if it were the indication of a uniformity of plan, and therefore the evidence of a primordial idea, is rather to be looked upon as the proof of unchangeable and resistless law.” Page 531.

The contrast here presented between the conception of a “plan,”—of “a primordial idea,”—and “resistless law,” can mean nothing less than blank Atheism. Even that milder form of Pantheism, which allows a soul of the world, could not so scout the conception of a “plan,” and a “primordial idea,” in the construction of the universe.

The author has here, unwittingly, in the full blaze of his “Age of Reason,” illustrated one of his own earlier phases of Humanity, by setting up, for his exclusive worship, a “fetische,” under the name of “unchangeable and resistless law.”

How grandly does Hooker’s description of Law contrast with the stolid conception of this “minute philosopher:—

“Of Law there can be no less acknowledged, than that her seat is in the bosom of God; her voice the harmony of the world; all things in heaven and earth do her homage, the very least as feeling her care, and the greatest as not exempted from her power; both angels and creatures, of what condition soever, though each in different sort and manner, admiring her as the mother of their peace and joy.”

This noble expression of the common feeling and intellect of mankind, uttered nearly three hundred years ago, and admired and adopted, ever since, as the most beautiful form of the universal thought, is a suggestive commentary upon the preten-

sion of a philosopher of this day, that it was necessary for him to compile a large volume, to prove that "the government of the world is accomplished by immutable law;" and that, as though for the first time, he was "to vindicate the imperishability, the majesty of law."

It is true, indeed, that this writer's conception of Law is as far as possible removed from that so grandly expressed by the immortal Hooker. We have seen already, that, by the general and honored term, Law, the author means nothing more, in this treatise upon "the intellectual development of Europe," than "physiological law," the mere evolution of material necessity. It is, as we have said, by the confusion of these two meanings of the term, that the author laboriously proves a truism, and illogically infers a ruinous falsehood.

We would not do injustice to this writer. He several times speaks of a God, and perhaps he believes in a Deity of some sort. But the God of his *treatise* is a being without capacity, and without power; like the material world, the passive and unresisting subject of that supposed higher entity, "resistless law."

But this book has another and a very different object from the one avowed by its author. Like its predecessor and copy, "Buckle's History of Civilization in England," it is an elaborate and bitter libel upon Christianity. To this purpose a large part of the volume is devoted. And the method is precisely that employed by Mr. Buckle, for the same end. The method is, in both cases, a dishonest use of that strong weapon of dialectics, the historical argument. Allow an unfair advocate to choose and arrange his facts, and he can prove, or seem to prove, anything. It is not necessary, for this purpose, that the supposed facts should be invented for the occasion. Every skillful lawyer knows that if he could only be permitted, without exposure, to select from the mass of testimony such of the facts, actually proved, as he desires, and arrange them in a proper order, he can make his own side of the case seem to be unanswerably plain.

This is the style of proof adopted by Mr. Buckle, and by Dr. Draper, in the atrocious picture of Christianity which they

have respectively presented. Although it would be rather bold to assert that they restricted their evidence to a mere *suppressio veri*,—simply selecting and arranging *one* set of *facts*, ignoring all the rest,—when we find the latter writer positively asserting, that the division of time into the week of seven days, “was unknown to the classical ancients, and to THE INSPIRED PENMEN.” Page 299. This assertion, in the face of the notorious fact, that the week of seven days forms one of the most prominent features of the Mosaic Ritual; and that, as it is impressed upon the physical constitution of man, so it was made a substantive part of that oral re-publication of the Moral Law, which is recorded in the book of Exodus; is a suggestive instance of that recklessness of advocacy which, when a fact is wanting, will not scruple to provide a suitable one for the purpose in hand.

The argument of this book is simply a reproduction of the worst form of the modern Infidel philosophy of France, combined with the superficial sophistry of the harsh denunciations of Volney and his compeers, of the preceding century.

With Volney and his school, all Supernaturalism is denounced by this author as alike fabulous, fit only for the infancy of the race,—“it is shaken off, as men and nations approach maturity.” Page 413. And all human testimony is discredited, as furnishing no foundation for belief, because so many lying wonders have been so attested.

The physiological classification of the progress of Humanity into the stages of Infancy, Childhood, Youth, Manhood, and Old age, corresponding respectively to the age of—1, Credulity; 2, Inquiry; 3, Faith; 4, Reason; 5, Decrepitude, is only a *professional* expansion of the previous classification of M. Comtè, the founder of the Positive Philosophy. He made the progress to consist of three stages:—

“The first, the theological or imaginative stage, wherein the mind inquires into final causes, and refers phenomena to special providence: the second, the metaphysical, wherein the idea of supernatural or personal causes, being discarded, it seeks for abstract essences: the third, the positive, wherein it rests content with generalized facts, and does not ask for causes. The first, in its religious phase, is theistic; the second, pantheistic; the third, atheistic. The perfection of science

consists in reaching the third stage, wherein the knowledge is strictly generalized from sensation." Farrar, page 295.

Now, strange to say, this pretentious philosophy is founded upon a negation of one half, and the most important half, of the whole realm of being. It allows the existence, and describes the qualities of passive and insensate matter; and utterly ignores the existence and attributes of the active and sentient spirit, which perceives and deals with that matter. Yet the same consciousness by which we know the existence of the first, even more directly conveys to us the knowledge of the second. The cognizance of spiritual being is, indeed, the primal act of self-consciousness, from which all other knowledge must proceed.

George Henry Lewes, the admiring disciple of M. Auguste Comtè, has written an elaborate and exceedingly interesting history of Philosophy, for the express purpose of proving that all Philosophy is worthless, a proved impossibility, and that it must, henceforth, give place to the Positive Science of his teacher. Now, in as far as Philosophy has pretended to tell us about "essences," to bridge the chasm between Finite and Infinite, to discourse dogmatically about the "Absolute," and the "Unconditioned;" by mere human powers to "find out the Almighty to perfection," we freely abandon it to the objurgations and tender mercies of these Positive professors. And because this soaring, and really unphilosophical Philosophy, has uniformly ended in Skepticism, Pantheism, or Atheism, it has been the duty and the custom of Christian Ministers, at all times, to expose the emptiness of this pretended knowledge, and to warn the people against its hurtful influence. And for the performance of this plain duty of their vocation, these Ministers have been freely and bitterly denounced, as going out of their proper sphere, and as the enemies of progress, and of free inquiry.

But there has been, all along, a class of Christian philosophers, who did not thus adventure, beyond the fixed limits of human inquiry. Locke, Berkley, Reid, Stewart, Hamilton, and many others, investigated the phenomena of Consciousness, in a proper, scientific method, and the results at which

they clearly arrived, have as much claim to be considered a part of Positive Science, as any of the more complicated departments of human knowledge. The continual revolutions in the so-called Systems of Mental Philosophy, have only been in the sphere of transcendental speculation, beyond the possibility of human knowledge.

The "method" of M. Comtè restricts all knowledge to the Physical Sciences. He comprises all human inquiry under five heads: Astronomy, Physics, Chemistry, Physiology, and Sociology. The last named, the science of Society, under any other nomenclature, would seem to signify something higher than Physical Science. But in this classification it is simply founded on Physiology, and deals, therefore, with nothing but the social complications of man, as an animal. And, accordingly, the American disciple of the Positive Philosophy exemplifies the "method" of his teacher, by constructing an elaborate treatise upon European Sociology, the "intellectual development of Europe," upon the sole basis of Physiology—the subjection of Society, and of man, to the "resistless, unchangeable laws" of material necessity.

Now, that this is an abnegation of the better part of true Science, even Mr. Lewes, sometimes, inadvertently allows. And if he were to carry out the principles which he has casually enounced in sundry passages of his learned work, he would add to the circle of the Positive Sciences, by interposing Psychology—the Science of the soul—between Physiology and Sociology; and this as legitimately, upon the very principles of the Positivist, as any of the Sciences actually named. Let us hear Mr. Lewes defining the Positive Philosophy:—

"If Sensation is but the effect of an External Cause, we, who can never know that Cause, *know it*, in its relation to us, i. e., in its effect. These Effects are as constant as their Causes; and, consequently, there can be a Science of Effects. Such a Science is that named Positive Science, the aim of which is to trace the Co-existences and Successions of Phenomena, i. e., to trace the relation of Cause and Effect, throughout the universe, submitted to our inspection." Page 304.

Again, space and time are declared to be "objective realities."

"Although, as we conceive them, they are purely subjective, and do not exist externally, as the space and time which exist in us, nevertheless, *some* external reality there is, corresponding to our subjective state; precisely as there must be some corresponding objects of solidity, color, &c.; otherwise, the conceptions of solidity, color, &c., would never have been formed." Page 646.

Very well. There are such phenomena as attention, reflection, comparison, inference, will, *judgment of right and wrong, with accompanying pleasure or pain*. All these are phenomena that do not come from sensation, and cannot be referred to the external world, and are altogether different from the phenomena which the Physical Sciences deal with. These phenomena differ, in their certainty and proof, from those of sensation, by being nearer to us—more immediately the objects of consciousness, of knowledge, because they need no "nexus," to connect the external world with the conscious ego.

The "Positive Philosophy" consists in the observation and classification of the phenomena obtained through sensation, and the laws which govern them. Is there not the same certitude, or a greater, in the Science which observes and classifies the other class of phenomena, and infers the laws which regulate them? Is the inference of an external world, the object of Natural Science, more logical or necessary than the inference of an internal subject of the other class of phenomena? The subject of one set of phenomena is called matter. May we not call the other mind, spirit, soul?

Does the Positivist deny that he attributes any being, any real existence, as the subject of sensational phenomena? This is, as Hume ingeniously confessed, but a juggle of words put upon the mind. No sober philosophy pretends to know substance or essence, apart from phenomena. It only infers, irresistibly, with the whole human race, that there is a real subject of all phenomena. We do not know the essence of matter, any more than we know the essence of mind; but we perceive—are conscious of—the phenomena of both, and are compelled to infer the real existence of both. We have no right to attribute both sets of phenomena to the same subject, because they differ essentially, and totally. Besides all other differences, there is this radical one. One set of these phe-

nomena cannot be separated from ourselves, but do indeed constitute that which we recognize, by consciousness, as the *ego*; and the other set are as plainly without us—the *non ego*.

As Mr. Lewes has affirmed, there “*must* be some corresponding objects of solidity, color, &c,” i. e., of all phenomena. We know, by consciousness, therefore, just as much of spirit, as we do of matter. We know nothing of the essence, the ultimate form, or nature, of either. But we do know two sets of phenomena, utterly distinct, variant, and opposite in character; and these we refer, by an irresistible law of mind, to a subject respectively of each. We have as certain knowledge of both these classes of phenomena, and of their respective subjects, as the human mind is capable of, and to complain of it, or declare it insufficient, is to quarrel with our nature, and to be guilty of something more childish than mere child’s play.

The distinction between physical and spiritual phenomena, in certainty and precision—the latter presenting a wide margin for diversity of judgment which is wanting in the former—comes from this. Physical phenomena are necessary, fixed, unchangeable, because the law of their action is necessary and invariable. Spiritual phenomena, inhering in a free intelligence, or,—if the Positivist objects to that assumption,—complicated by the phenomena of freedom, and subject, therefore, only to the moral law, are liable to perpetual change, variation and inconstancy. This very contrast differences the two classes of phenomena, and their respective subjects, as far as possible. Yet it is from a strange confusion of thought in regard to this distinction, that the Positivist infers that what is thus variable and inconstant, has no existence at all; and so he ignores and puts out of sight an immense mass of phenomena, because he cannot formularize them with the exactitude which can be applied to material movements.

The fundamental principle of Positivism is, that it will only inquire into phenomena, and their relations. By the force of this principle it was bound to inquire into that most concerning of all relations between phenomena—the relation of Cause and Effect. And, as we have seen, Mr. Lewes naturally, and with true philosophic accuracy, defines the aim of Positive Sci-

ence to be, "to trace the relation of Cause and Effect throughout the universe submitted to our inspection." This definition must have been made under the unconscious control of a correct and logical train of thought, producing a temporary forgetfulness of the gross inconsistency of the actual Positivism. That system specially and earnestly refuses to inquire into this all-comprehending relation. Its two professed and grand peculiarities are, that it declines to inquire into "essences and causes." Yet, if it is really, and in good faith, the science of Phenomena and their relations, why put under the ban, and carefully exclude this important relation, without which there can, in fact, be no science? The answer is plain. The relation of Cause and Effect necessarily leads to a First Cause—a Creator—a God. To avoid the necessity of this dreaded conclusion, Positivism will commit a *felo de se*, and make its two fundamental principles mutually contradictory, and therefore mutually destructive.

But the effort to ignore this relation is simply impotent. No juggle of language, no confusion of thought, can put it away. Without it, the knowledge of phenomena would be a mere fortuitous and indigested heap, no more like science, than a pile of corn is like science. It does not alter the case at all to change the terminology, and speak of "the fixed relation of Co-existence and Succession." This is but an awkward synonym for Cause and Effect. The relation and its necessity are what the mind requires and provides, *as the condition of real knowledge*, in order to make out of mere facts a science. That relation is paramount and primitive. Every inference that the naturalist draws is under the control of that relation, and derives its legitimacy from it. This law of mind alone gives the necessary unity to phenomena, by which they can be reduced to a science.

Nor does it at all affect this principle, whether we derive our knowledge of the relation of Cause and Effect wholly from the mind, as an innate principle, or law of thought, or refer it to experience, upon which the unitizing mind operates. The attempted analysis of this relation into experience, controlled and modified by "a law of the understanding," changes nothing

in this regard. These gentlemen object to the expressions—"laws of thought," "necessary truths," "fundamental laws of belief." But the objection is so purely idle, and in opposition to their own consciousness, that in the very effort to state it, they are compelled to furnish a substitute of equivalent meaning. Thus Mr. Lewes, on this very point of the supposed reduction of our conception of Cause and Effect to Experience, tells us, that "the universality and necessity of our ideas, is nothing more nor less than the suggestions of the understanding, which, by the law of its operation, generalizes from particulars, and converts them into universals." Page 660.

There is something, then, besides experience, to give the conception of cause and effect. These "*suggestions of the understanding by the law of its operation*," are as real and as necessary as the succession of facts; and they are just as potent as "necessary truths," or "laws of thought," and are but a slightly different form of expressing the same thing. The facts expressed by the old and better forms of speech—"necessary truths," "laws of thought," &c., are vouchers for truth only, on the postulate, as avowed by Kant, of faith in our own nature, and in the Author of that nature. A greater than Kant, long before, declared the same truth. "Now, faith is the *substance* of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." Ep. Heb. 11 : 1. The "*suggestions of the understanding by the law of its operation*," explain just as much and as well, *on the same postulate of faith in our nature, and in Him who made it*. Without that postulate, man can know nothing, not himself, not phenomena. He can have no Positive Science, or science of any kind. He is driven to the impossible absurdity of universal skepticism. The Positive Philosophy, therefore, in its present form, stultifies itself, its author, and its disciples. The whole system is founded upon an insane negation of the very powers with which these men are working, when they observe and classify physical phenomena, and when they weave their poisonous web of sophistry and delusion. The vice of this fatal oblivion of more than half the truth of Nature, passes into every form and modification of the system.

So, when these gentlemen talk in lofty strains about Law, its majesty, and its imperishability, all that they mean and intend is, Physical Law, forgetting, utterly, that there is another and higher department of Law—the Moral Law—governing and ruling over free spiritual intelligences, as the Physical Law governs and controls brute and insensate matter.

It is in beautiful consistency, therefore, with this maimed and impotent Philosophy, or rather with this abnegation of Philosophy and Reason, that the American teacher of Positivism refers the intellectual development of nations, and the progress of mankind, not to the combined operation of these two great departments of universal Law, but merely to Physiological Law ; making these mighty results to be identical with “bodily growth.”

It is not often that the enemies of Christianity so run out their principles to this *reductio ad absurdum*. Philosophy and Religion are therefore indebted to this author, for the feat by which he has exposed the offensive nakedness of the system, and its contemptuous disregard of the foundations of human knowledge and of human reason.

A just conception of the whole truth, as disclosed to man in Nature and in the oral Revelation, gives a far more perfect comprehension of the condition and progress of mankind, of the rise, prosperity and decay of nations, than these puerile conceits of arbitrary stages of growth, under the coercive force of mere physical law.

The Universe is governed by Law. The Material part of the Universe by Physical Law, necessary, resistless, inexorable; because the condition of matter is one of necessity, of inertia, of passivity. It has no will, and therefore no freedom. On the contrary, the essential condition of the Spiritual part of the Universe is freedom. It has a Will. The Law, therefore, to which it is subject, is Moral, and may be disobeyed. The Law is not the less a binding rule, governing the Spiritual world ; for where the Moral Law is disobeyed, the penalty attaches, and cannot be escaped.

The old formula, conveying the common determination of reflecting men in regard to the progress and decay of nations,

contains more true philosophy, more real knowledge of man and his relations, than all the treatises of the school we are examining, which the last century has produced. That formula is,—Industry, frugality, and increase of knowledge, produce wealth and power, and the nation expands into greatness. But power tempts to pride, and wealth to luxury and vice. Here the Moral Law is in effective operation, and that may be disobeyed, though not with impunity. If pride and luxury and vice obtain the ascendancy, the Moral and Physical powers of the members of the community are weakened—a physiological Law is now brought into active coöperation with the Moral Law in shaping the destiny of the nation—and national decay presently commences.

Revealed Religion is the moral force which the gracious Creator has interposed between human corruption and the destruction which is the ordinary issue of this progress. To the benign operation of this new, healthful, and restraining force, Europe owes all her present superiority over the other portions of the earth. The Atheistic Philosophy has been continually engaged, in aid of human vice and wantonness, in trying to neutralize the power of this superadded source of health and strength to diseased humanity. And the success or failure of these combined efforts to destroy the influence of Christianity is and has been the real problem of European, and of American Civilization.

Compare the philosophy of this brief and simple statement of the known facts in the history of the rise, progress, and decline of Nations, with the pretentious theories and arbitrary systems of the recent Anti-Christian School. Take Buckle's theory, that Natural Science is the only Civilizer, and Religion the constant obstruction to progress, and to high attainment. This theory is not only in manifest opposition to the facts of the case, but is self-contradictory. For, if Truth is a power in human affairs, if Knowledge is the chief element of progress, then, by the necessities of the proposition, Religious Knowledge,—if there be such a thing, which Buckle fully allows,—must exercise its own proportional influence in the Civilization which is the product of Knowledge. This conclusion,

contained in Mr. Buckle's own premises, disposes of his theory, and of his elaborate work in proof of it, as a mere baseless assumption, as unphilosophical in its structure as it is untrue in its foundation.

Dr. Draper only amends Mr. Buckle's theory, by the statement, that progress is nothing but the development of intellect. Now, Religious Knowledge, as it is the most interesting and the most important, is the first subject to stir and agitate the minds of men, and so develop their intellectual powers, and fit them for adventuring upon other fields of inquiry. Leaving out of view the refutation of the theory contained in its own terms, and its contradiction of all the known facts of the case, the allegation that the power which is most effectual in repressing vice, and in encouraging virtue and beneficence, is an obstruction to human progress and civilization, is surely the strangest freak of bigotry and prejudice which has ever been exhibited.

Compare, again, the true Philosophy of man and of society, with the arbitrary System of Dr. Draper, founded, not upon a single reason, or upon any fact, but upon a fanciful analogy with the Physical System of the individual man. And because each man has his period of infancy, youth, manhood, and old age, therefore every nation must run its predestined and inevitable course of "Credulity, Inquiry, Faith, Reason, and Decrepitude." No matter what the conduct of a man, no matter how perfectly he obeys the Physical and Moral Laws of his being, old age, with its weakness and decrepitude, by virtue of the physical Law to which his body is subject, inevitably comes on. So the nation, according to this physiological scheme, whether virtuous or vicious, magnanimous or mean, self-denying or luxurious, must obey its destiny, attain its "age of decrepitude," and die. Thus all motive to National Morality is removed, and the thing itself is scouted as an impossible fiction; and the nation, in common with the portion of earth which it occupies, is made the passive subject of "resistless" physical laws.

If the system, as a whole, thus proves to be a negation of all that is distinctive and valuable in humanity, its details as

utterly ignore all distinction of terms, and all reasonable analysis. Credulity, Faith, Reason, are distinguished as separate stages of the human mind and of human progress. But Faith without Reason is simple Credulity; while Faith founded upon Reason is the highest reach of human faculties, as all philosophies have, directly or indirectly, demonstrated, the true directly, the false indirectly, by their pretentious absurdities. Again, Reason without Faith is the veritable intellectual decrepitude into which men may fall, as the punishment of pride and self-conceit. It is the human mind on stilts, far enough above the earth, but feeble and unnatural in its gait, and continually falling headlong into the mire.

But this arbitrary classification of the stages of human progress, in analogy to the physiological Law, of personal growth and decay, has not even a decent analogy to support it. Infancy is not the age of credulity, but emphatically the age of inquiry. So prominent is this characteristic, and so active is the infant mind, that it is a reasonable calculation, that a man learns more in the first six years of life, than ever afterwards. And on the most profound problems of human life and relations, these infant minds are continually confounding their parents and teachers, by proposing unanswerable questions. Again, Childhood is not especially the age of inquiry, but, as the necessities of physical development require, the age of boisterous and thoughtless sport.

The Professor's third stage of correspondence is so wide a departure from the truth of Nature, as known by all observers, that his special reputation as a Naturalist is seriously jeopardized. Youth the age of Faith! according to Dr. Draper's "resistless" physiological law! Did the learned Professor find that Law in operation in his model empire, China, where society is founded, as he says, on the only true basis, the public organization of Intellect? Certainly, he has not found this "resistless law" in operation in any branch of the Caucasian race with which we are acquainted. All observation attests that youth is the age of proud and presumptuous reason, when everything is questioned, and all truth is submitted to the judgment of that vaulting faculty; and when those momentous truths, espe-

cially, which would restrain the raging passions, are rudely cast away.

Dr. Draper is verbally correct in one point of his classification. Manhood is the age of Reason—not the reason of the Positive Philosopher, rejecting and abjuring Faith—but of that nobler Reason, the truest exercise of which is to make manhood the age of Faith as well. It is, for the most part, only when the intellect is mature, and has tried and tested its powers, that man learns to receive, in trusting faith, a thousand truths of infinite concernment, which the Reason is incompetent to discover, or to compass. Thus the system of Dr. Draper breaks down at every point, in its general principle, and in each one of its details. Even admitting his first general and degrading principle, that the destiny of Man and of Society is determined by nothing higher than Physiological Law, the Laws which he has improvised for the exigencies of his theory, turn out to be no Laws at all, but mere assertions, in direct contradiction of the known facts of the case.

There is one specialty of the modern assaults upon Revelation, from the Scientific stand-point, which it may be worth while here to notice, because it is continually referred to, in terms of highest approbation, by Dr. Draper. This is, the alleged Origin of Species, by transmutation, and gradual development of all animal forms, from the lowest, up to, and including man. Near the close of the last century, Dr. Darwin started this idea, in his *Zoönomia*, a work which was quite popular for a time, and was in most of the Medical Libraries of this country forty years ago. The notion died out of scientific appreciation, until it was revived, very recently, in a modified form, by a descendant of its first proposer. Dr. Draper will not commit himself to the theory of the younger Darwin; but he suggests, and throughout this book *assumes as true*, a modification of that theory, which he seems to think is in stricter keeping with his great principle, that “the government of the world is accomplished by immutable Law.”

All life, he says, begins with a *simple cell*, apparently homogeneous. The form which this cell may assume is determined entirely by the “material conditions” to which it may

be submitted. "Any variation" of these material conditions "would be forthwith followed by a corresponding variation in the form;" and "the fanciful doctrine of the immutability of species would be brought to its true value." Page 6. Thus he accounts for the origin, and the succession of Species, each form appearing when the "mundane conditions" admitted of its existence, and ceasing when those conditions were changed. And he especially cautions us against assigning this succession, and these changes, to "the issue of wise predeterminations of a voluntary agent." "To this doctrine of the control of physical agencies over organic forms, I acknowledge no exceptions, not even in the case of Man." Page 7. The Primordial cell then evolved itself into a man, as soon as the material conditions were all consenting, apart from "the wise predetermination of a voluntary agent."

No one complains more bitterly than Dr. Draper, that Religious considerations are made to bear adversely upon scientific theories. Clearly, as we have shown, Philosophy has no right to complain of this process. All facts, or supposed facts, must be examined in a true method of philosophizing, with reference to one another. By this comparison the true will stand, the false will disappear. So it has happened in every instance heretofore. False notions of Religion, arrayed against the real facts of Science, have been exposed and banished. And false assumptions of Science, tending to subvert some precious truth of Religion, have been discredited and swept away. The process has been legitimate and healthful at all times.

It is not necessary to test the theory above developed by Religious considerations. Its own weakness is its sufficient refutation. For six thousand years, at least, the material conditions which permit the existence of man, and of all the present races of animals, subject to our observation, have been in full operation. Yet, in all that time, there has never been found an instance of one of these "simple cells" developing into any other form than that from which it came. The one "material condition" of the development of any special form, without which all other conditions have been of no efficiency, is, *that the simple cell be, at some period, in the matrix of a being of*

of the same form. Now, we are the advocates of the universal supremacy of Law. And here is a foundation, as broad as the whole world can furnish, for the assertion of a LAW, unchangeable, and resistless, which no power but that of the Law Giver can reverse or control.

The advocate of this theory has his ready answer to this plain demonstration. Historical time—a poor six thousand years, is nothing, he says, in the earth's age. We can call for sixty millions or billions of years, instead of six thousand, and that inconceivable period is sufficient for the production of effects which, to our limited experience, seem to be impossible. Therefore, the transmutation of Species, and the law of favoring material conditions, is a scientific fact, which only bigoted ignorance will deny; and man is but the last in the series of that "orderly progression" of living forms, which is the necessary result of this law, and the "wise predeterminations of a voluntary agent," have had nothing to do with his existence! And this is what a certain class of Naturalists call Science, and logic, and reason! Known and definite time gives us certain facts, and a certain Law: therefore, unknown and indefinite time will give facts, the reverse of the former, and a contrary Law!

It is legitimate, to argue from the known to the unknown, and modestly to infer an *analogy* in things of the same sort. But, to argue from the known to the unknown, and infer in the latter the reverse of all the facts, laws, and principles established in the former, is a feat of Logic performed only by those whose object is to prove that "the wise predeterminations of a voluntary agent" have had nothing to do with the business of Creation. This reference of conjectural facts and laws to the possible operation of inconceivable periods of time, is nothing but a juggle put upon the mind, when both intellect and imagination are stunned and overwhelmed by the vastness of the attempted thought; and doubtless our Naturalists are themselves the victims of the delusion they try to propagate.

The same juggle is practised upon the mind in regard to the "simple cell." There is an infinite below, as well as above us. A Naturalist would hardly venture to assert that a partridge's

egg would produce a crocodile. But when the ovum is reduced so low as to approach the "infinitely little," the imagination is again overwhelmed, and in the consequent confusion of thought, all possible and impossible results may be with impunity asserted. Yet the true and only Infinite, the Creator, has assigned to each of these "simple cells" its own specific and definite development, from which it cannot depart. This is the ascertained law of all the known facts, not the arbitrary dictum of Religion.

The theory of the "simple cell," and of the progressive transmutations of Species under modified mundane conditions, is another effort to bridge over the chasm between Finite and Infinite, and to arrive at a *beginning* of things, without the interposition of a Creator, as futile and as impotent as any of the attempts of transcendental Metaphysics, to accomplish the same impracticable result. All that Embryology and Comparative Anatomy have proved, in this regard, is that wonderful UNITY of plan and of design in the Animal Kingdom, combined with unlimited VARIETY, which meets us at every reading of God's great book of Nature.

The mind of man is incompetent to conceive a beginning of things. He knows that there was a beginning, but the nature of that beginning is utterly beyond his powers of conception. It is a mystery of God's working, hid away in the fathomless deep of God's own infiniteness. To a Creation and a Creator, the human soul is compelled to come, as the last term of all its researches. But the act itself is inconceivable by our finite powers. All was completed before man began to know. He was not there to counsel with God, or to assist Him. Therefore no faculties were bestowed upon man adequate to the comprehension of a work with which he was to have nothing to do. Another faculty of the soul, than the Understanding, takes cognizance of the wondrous fact,—the mighty miracle of Creation. "Through FAITH we understand that the worlds were framed by the Word of God, so that things which are seen, were not made of things which do appear." Heb. 11 : 3.

It gives us great pleasure to add, that Dr. Draper, near the close of his book, confesses his belief in a "Personal God," and

in the existence of an "immortal soul" in man. In this good confession he departs from his European *confreres*, and from the Science, "falsely so called," which he has so elaborately and ingeniously constructed, as a History of the Intellectual Development of Europe. We doubt not that his life is determined by that Faith, rather than by the illusory Science of this learned work. That work falls in with the current of anti-Christian thought in Europe and America, and has therefore been greeted in a way which must be very gratifying to the author. But the FAITH which he professes, and which contains the refutation of all his theories, is the Rock upon which he will desire to stand, long after his book has been forgotten.

ART. IV.—SOME THOUGHTS ABOUT SO CALLED GRECIAN CHURCHES.

GOthic Architecture is emphatically Christian Architecture, whether we look at it from a historical or a symbolical point of view ; and it is accordingly becoming a rule having the force of an axiom, that Churches should be built only in that Style. But, unhappily, it is only comparatively lately that this truth has been seen or acknowledged ; and we have on hand many non-descript buildings, comfortable enough in the inside to suit congregations, and sufficiently costly not to allow of their being torn down to make way for a real Church.

What can be done with them, if we are not allowed to pull them down? How can a real Chancel,—that is, a Chancel containing all such essential parts as that the Church-Service may be performed decently and in order,—be added to any building to which it is not architecturally allowable to add Gothic details? What is best to be done with certain Church Buildings of the so called *Grecian* Style, which we find upon our hands ; too valuable as mere buildings to be torn down, and too sacred from their past associations to be transferred to secular uses?

Such are the points, to the plain and practical discussion of which, we would invite any who may feel an interest in the subject. The questions are by no means easy to answer. Nor do we feel entirely certain what the answer should be. It might be best to give the go-by to all these *ci-devant* Greek Churches, and advocate their indiscriminate destruction. It is very certain they can never be made all that a *Church* ought to be. If indeed there were such a thing as a real Greek building in America, our problem would be less complicated. We should say at once, "Enclose that building in glass and preserve it to show what the last (originating) Nation of the Old World were enabled to do in the way of perfect beauty—such as they might attain unto." But, as there is no such thing in America,

(nor probably elsewhere) which would answer a Museum-purpose for the preservation of what Phidias or Praxiteles would acknowledge as GREEK ART ; we shall e'en have to remain contented with the dishevelled glory of the Parthenon, which, after all, will give a better hint to the imagination than even a purposed reproduction of that wonderful structure. Such purposed reproduction cannot be yet made,—not with all the congregated knowledge of German Architects and English Painters. Phidias must come back to tell us how to fit jointures in hewn stone so infinitessimally bevelled as to work in with the vast ellipses which rule throughout a Doric building ; and Praxiteles must tell how any man should dare to cover a structure finished from top to bottom, outside and in, with a cameo-polish on the purest Pentelic marble,—how he should dare to cover that building with gold and ivory and color, as it seems to be acknowledged that they did. They certainly crowned Minerva's Architrave, on the exterior, with a tiara of repeated golden shields ; they set within the outer sanctuary a Chryselephantine image which would put to shame the richest statuary ever since devised ; and they blazoned the ceilings of the whole building with fretted fields of enrichment in carvings, gold, and color, the like of which the modern world can scarcely so much as imagine. There remains no wonder to any student of Doric Art, that the Parthenon should have been the centre of the Greek Nation ; so the student of a work of more awful and still more inconceivable Beauty, the Temple of Solomon, wonders not that that Heaven-descended Temple was, what every Patristic reader of the Psalter knows it to have been. The *truly* glorious Temple of Solomon was the Centre of the Jewish Nation, and its absolutely overwhelming majesty of glory and beauty exerted that power of subduing and of winning, which all true beauty,—above all, the beauty of Holiness,—inspires.

It will advance our subject, if we merely take a glance at those structures around us which have been, or may be called, of the "Grecian Order." Here we must premise that there is one and one only Grecian Order,—it is the *Doric Style* ; and it ought to be called *Grecian Architecture*. It formed the

great Temple, and of course therefore the great National Style of the Greek people. The real Greek never thought of building a large temple in other than the Doric Style. The Triple-temple on the Acropolis, with its three windows* was erected as a piece of sacred symbolism. The Greek architect, when he came from the toil of successfully adjusting some intangible curve of a Doric labor, would sit down to rest, and then play with *Corinthian* foliations ; and, taking up a long standing order for a Tripod-base, might pedestal the brazen Prize with a toy such as that known as the Choragic Monument of Lysicrates. There was a great temple once built in the Ionic Order, an Order that the Greeks had no more to do with, as respects its invention, than with the winged-bulls of Khursabad. It was indeed a "great" temple, and it was built by the same Ephesian mob of Greeks and Easterns, who afterwards cried "Great is Diana." And it was just such a travesty of the really beautiful, as such a people might be expected to produce.

There was no single instance of a Greek National Temple having other than Doric columns outside, and Ionic (Assyrian) columns within. No Architect that again builds in a Grecian Order, should ever do otherwise than put Doric columns outside, and Ionic columns inside his building ; the outside columns to be unchanged from the known proportions left by Phidias on Acropolis or by Ictinus at Bassæ. The Ionic columns may be varied, and very considerably so, at least in detail, though not in proportion ; and for detail of capital let him study the exterior and only columns of the Triple temple.

The only exterior Ionic building of Temple-architecture which we remember among the pure Greeks, was the beautiful little building on the Island of Teos. It was a sacred building, though used for the meetings of the Masonic Association, and it had porches in the same general style as the front of the Triple-temple on Acropolis, but with considerable variety of detail. Any one who has seen the porticos of the Literary Halls on the grounds of the College of New Jersey, will know how the two ends of that beautiful little gem looked, as far as

* The only window ever known in a Grecian consecrated building.

could be represented on the ground and with the materials used. If the Society of Free-masons should desire a place of common gathering to hold their great conclaves, a Peripteral even like "Diana of the Ephesians" might not be much out of place; but even that would probably excite the pity of a real Greek. We imagine Pericles or Ictinus a little puzzled at the proposition to loan their vast shears and sand-bags, used in Doric raisings, for the purpose of elevating an Ionic column. What then would have been their bewilderment at the suggestion of such means being necessary to raise a Corinthian pillar? There is no instance,—at least none was known ten years ago,—of a *Greek* Corinthian column which might not be lifted up and carried by two or three men. If such a magnificent mistake as the great building on the grounds of the Girard College had been committed in the days when the "Street of the Choragi" was being filled with its Tripod-basements, it could only have been under some Italian who had forgotten his Roman citizenship, and had not judgment to perceive that his Athenian training had only made him a quasi Greek.

If Girard College Edifice had been built of brown stone in the solid bell-shape *Roman* Corinthian, such as the gorgeous capitals in the central façade of the Roman Cathedral on Logan Square in the same city, we then should have had in America the fullest idea the modern world has seen of what was the first real Architecture of old Rome; and that was the Choragic Play-Thing of the Athenian builder made massive in sandstone like the huge, almost Egyptian blocks, of Baalbec, with diminished intercolumniations, and capitals rich and gorgeous as only the Roman cotemporary with Cæsar's legions could have designed. And thus would we have had a Roman Corinthian Peripteral,—the only proper Corinthian Art ever made, and which is, beyond question, the æsthetic basis of the Continental Gothic as distinguished from the English. The Square Chancel of glorious York brings to mind the Parthenon, while the loftiest and most apparantly ideal Apse of any Italian building, will only remind one of the ruins of Baalbec, or at best of the temple of Adrian.* All this and much more,

* The modern Pantheon.

will be readily felt by any one who will compare the confusing magnificence of the Continental Chevet with the simpler grandeur of the Anglican Square Chancel.

Having said thus much concerning the comparative merit of American Greek reproductions, we will now go on to the main point aimed at in this Article ; only premising that, while we do not believe that Grecian Architecture is Christian Architecture, neither do we believe that anything so gloriously grand in its chastened sublimity, and so overpowering in its winning loveliness as was the Doric Art of Athens, should be looked upon as a production altogether of the natural man, without the assistance of a holier Spirit than to Plato or to Pericles had as yet been specifically made known. The Parthenon was to the nation which, under God, made the language of the New Testament,—the last originating Nation of the Old World,—as a shadow reminding one of the Covenanted Acropolis of Judæa.

We have then, leaving out of account all side-issues whatever, to ask the practical question,—“What shall we do with such valuable Church buildings as we have on hand, which have been put up by Architects who knew the difference between Grecian Doric, Roman Corinthian, and nondescript Palladian ?” And, in the first place, we will sedulously avoid any attempt to spoil what we have, by the addition of Norman, otherwise called, Romanesque, elements ; such as rounding the window-heads, or introducing the circular headed arch in profile. No Greek ever so much as saw a circular arch, unless it might have been old Herodotus, when the hierophants of Egypt took him into the Labyrinth. With the exception of the circular ground plan of the column, there is no curved line in the whole Grecian building but the one line of the *ellipse*. We would desire to draw particular attention to this point. The whole meaning of the Article we are writing, turns upon the single question, whether an arch may properly be joined to the Greek horizontal.

Old Rome tried the experiment. About the time that Julius Cæsar obtained the permission of the Senate to place a Pediment, hitherto sacred to Temple Architecture, on his

dwelling-house, Adrian added a Rectangular Roman Corinthian vestibule to the dome-covered Pantheon. In St. Paul's, of New York, we find an English form of the Renaissance. The most contemptible form of this style will be found in the City of Paris ; the most sensible, in the city of London ; the best, in the palaces of Italy. The City of New York contains a genuine specimen of this Fifteenth Century Architecture, in the City Hall. If that building were the Mayor's Palace, it would be a fair specimen of the Style in which the real builders of the Palladian Era wrought. But when this Architecture, which is nothing but the old Roman cut up small, was transferred from the City Street and the Palatian Hall, to the use of a worshipping assembly, a great inversion of things was indeed effected. Never, before the time of Leo X., or the time when the present pontifical Basilica of Rome was started by Angelo, the great Sculptor, but by no means as great an Architect, had it been known that Temple-architecture could grow out of Civil-architecture, but always the opposite. The present St. Peter's is a Palladian, or Brunelleschian Palace, turned into a vast dome-covered Church. This is a significant era in Architecture.

How could the men who built such a palace as the City Hall of New York might be made, supposing it the residence of an Italian nobleman, go on to build such columns as are at the Broadway end of St Paul's, and call them Greek ? Though, when we pass round to the other end of St. Paul's, and see the Porch, and pass under the really fine steeple, we are glad to be reminded of our dear Old Mother of England, and of Sir Christopher Wren—the one man who has shown, in the steeple of St. Bride's and in the plan of St. Paul's Cathedral, that the worst debasement ever known to have been wrought upon any great historical style, in the whole course of comparative Architecture, could be made a tolerable thing for a Christian Church. The so-called Renaissance which grew up under Leo X., was brought about by the breaking up of the horizontal lines of the rectangular Roman Corinthian, and by superimposing the circular-headed arch—the architecture of the Roman Bridge. If you have a Church in the Sir Christopher

Wren Style, with a high and well graduated Steeple, hold fast to it, if it be worthy,—but do not call it Greek nor Roman Architecture, but what it is, the Anglican form of the Renaissance of Leo Tenth. If you desire to improve its interior, you may give your fancy free play ; you may attach broken pediments, lay on fluted pilasters, and crowd on richness of ornament, but do not expect to be satisfied with the result. An interior “Sir Christopher Wren” may, in these days, be made to take on a certain kind of richness, but it will be at the expense of bedizenment, all the details of that Italian art being so unutterably low and earthly in their contours. Its best success, we fear, would but too painfully remind us of the injury which every student of Architecture has associated with all the elements of that world-product, the Renaissance.

As we have already shown, Roman Architecture was formed when the Roman people took the Choragic Monument of Lysicrates, and made out of it a rich and gorgeous Corinthian Temple. A specimen of this first and only real art of Ancient Rome, may be found in the Roman Cathedral on Logan Square, Philadelphia, and the two grand columns of that façade will give a good illustration of what we mean by Roman Architecture. It was the work of a great Nation, who were called to originate nothing, but to apply and misapply all things. It means Rome, Pagan Rome, Imperial Rome ; the Style marks, all over the earth, the progress of her trampling foot-prints, wherever it appears, whether in the gorgeously massive blocks and oppressive enrichments of the ruins at Baalbec, or in the effeminacy of its Augustan reduction of mass and increase of intercolumniations, as in the happily unfinished double Peripteral, begun under the very shadow of the Parthenon Hill ; or in the ostentatiousness of entasis and Bacchanal wildness of such a front as the old Girard Bank in Philadelphia ; or in the unfluted literalism of such a front as St. John’s Church in New York. It means Rome, degenerate Rome, Rome that first overspread all things, and then corrupted, debased, literalized, transubstantiated, all things. Rome had talent and energy ; Rome had law and organization ; legions and powers ; but Rome had not that glorious and wonderful thing, which men

call Imagination; at least, not what Coleridge would admit to be properly so called. Rome had fancy, as all right earnest workers have; but the true Imagination, such as in Architecture knows where to stop, and rejects at least a thousand things for one that it makes use of, such as can form curves while apparently only making straight lines, she never had. That kind of Imagination in Architecture was the gift and prerogative of the Athenian people, about the time when Pericles completed the great Temple of Minerva on Acropolis.

We can easily enough find Roman-Corinthian showing itself by no uncertain token in the Continental Gothic; but, if the grand repose of *Doric Art* is not perpetuated in the Square Chancel of York, then the most perfect Art of the most perfect nation which the world has seen, outside the Revealed Covenant, has been forever lost sight of, unless it should be revived by some future nation before the day when material Temples shall be no more needed.

We have shown where, and how, the real Greek Architecture was dropped. It only remains to say, that that which the Romans did take, and make glorious, according to an earthly glory, was changed and finally ruined by the introduction of the bridge-line. That line is the circle. It is not an ideal line, it can be scribed with compass. An ideal line can neither be drawn with ruler or scribed with instrument. There is no line in Greek Art made otherwise than by the hand, guided by the inspiring imagination. The curved lines of our modern Greek reproductions, are generally pretty good. There is no one of them, as every draughtsman knows, which can be made, gracefully, by any drawing instrument. If there be any draughtsman of Greek specifications who has not found this out, we would remind him how he has ever found that all his curves must be drawn from two centres; all, that is, with the single exception of the ground-plan of his columns, whether it were to scribe the plan for the flutings, to find the sweep of that noblest of all the curves of the Building-art, the *Doric Echinus*, to mark out an enlarged Egg and dart, or to undertake to find the reaches of the great ellipses. Let the worker in Greek Style only remember how all his details are gained from two centres,

and he will see that we have a meaning when we affirm that Greek Art consists of curves of the second order, and that it has no section of the cone, appearing to the eye, except in the very way the cone itself reveals its sections, as it remains standing, like the column, on the hidden circle of its base. Hence the singular ignorance of those books which say, that Greek Architecture is made up of reëntering lines which never escape from their own bands. There is a sense in which this is true, and must ever be true, of all militant style. Far be it from us to say, that the Greek Chevron is as Christian an ornament as the Gothic scroll, and yet, if you wished to design a proper moulding for a Church, built according to Ezekiel's prophetic measurements, it would, undoubtedly, be from Greek patterns that you would select your borderings.

May it not be possible, then, to take a so-called Grecian Assembly-room, and attach to it a real Chancel ;—real in such a sense that it may contain all necessary conveniences for the celebration of Holy Service, so arranged, as not to shock the cultivated taste, or the sanctified imagination ?

The first thing to be done, will be, to run back the Chancel as far as convenience in ministration and the comfort of the audience, both as to sight and sound, will permit. We make this reservation, because, while the Chancel should be as large as possible, it should not be so deep as to remove the Altar from the view of the side-aisles. The reason why the whole Chancel addition should be large, may be found in the fact, that a large rectangular space, well proportioned, imparts always a certain sense of quiet satisfaction ; and that feeling is, essentially, Greek. The one idea which pervades the Doric building is, that of repose. This idea or feeling will always be harmed by the addition of anything not perceived to be necessary. Thus, in an ordinary building, one is often quite surprised to find how ill-chosen furniture will have the effect of diminishing the apparent size and repose of the rooms.

It is important to note that much of the satisfaction we feel in certain buildings, is due to successful *proportion*. Now, the mystery of Proportion,—and Proportion is indeed a mystery,—has been embodied in Doric Architecture, to a more surprising

degree than in any of the other Ancient Styles. So remarkable was the success at this point, that their buildings, of themselves, irrespective of the added columns, bore such an adjustment of the dimensions of length, height, and breadth, as to carry with them, in all cases, that peculiar feeling of stability and rest, of which we are speaking. The Chancel opening, then, in the instance of a Doric Church, should always be carefully proportioned, and unencumbered by needless accessories. It should seek to impart the feeling of a noble and unpretending quiet. Of nothing is it truer, than of Greek Proportion, that its "beauty is" then "most adorned when unadorned the most."

The ground-plan of the Chancel must *not* be finished in the circular form. We are willing to stake the whole truth as to this question on the fact, that the circular line, with the single exception of the ground-plan of the exterior columns, has no part in a Grecian building. A Chancel, however nobly proportioned in other respects, cannot be finished with a semi-circular end, without intrinsically perverting that idea of mingled majesty and rest, which will unfailingly be secured if the end wall is finished square, and as free of break as possible. We would earnestly counsel that nothing that can be avoided should be suffered to mar the repose of that spacious and simple end wall. A grand, Greek-like proportioned, white marble Altar, with plain but solid finish, should alone meet the eye at that spot. Let the Episcopal Seat, at the northern end, be as subdued an accessory as possible. The Grecian chair is, by the way, like all other pure Greek elements, simple and unpretensive. Light may be obtained from the roof, and thus obviate the necessity of any break in the Chancel wall. The ceiling may be formed of bold and deeply receding Lacunaria, among which, a sufficient number of richly stained glass windows may be introduced.

Imagine, then, a large opening, say twenty-five feet wide, spanned with a noble elliptical arch, with unfluted corner-piers, and chapters of the richest Corinthian enfoliation; then run back the Chancel walls so that the Choir may form a perfect Square, and place the Sanctuary behind. Construct the roof with its deep sunken panels, and these you may enrich with

exquisite curvings ; then let the richest and the softest glass shed down the light on walls unbroken by windows, and whose beauty of proportion is unmarred by column or pilaster. The Holy Table, say of white marble, and all the other Chancel furniture, are simple in form, and massive, without gorgeousness of finish. As the mind pictures this scene, does there not arise a feeling of peaceful repose—of gentle tranquillity ? Here you will not feel tempted to rouse passion by stirring words ; or to excite feeling by highly wrought appeal. But here you may kneel, in reverent prayer, and list to the still small voice that comes not to us in the thunder and tempest, but in the attitude of Rest. Here you may find a Sabbath rest, a holy calm, like the Summer twilight, drawing our thoughts above, and reminding us of that rest which remaineth for the people of God.

ART. V.—THE OUTWARDNESS OF OUR POPULAR RELIGION.

RELIGION, like all other forces affected by human influence, has its variations. Its mould and drift are never identical in any two generations. In one age it is contemplative, in another, active. The Mystic and the Rationalist, the cloistered devotee and the man of affairs, change places at intervals. At one time Religion, sharing in the fluctuating temper of the multitude, makes a general movement toward deserts and monasteries ; at another, toward the busy, bustling centres of common life. A history of the Kingdom of God, as administered by men, would be a history of periodic oscillations between the extremes of a life too inward and a life too outward. To which of these extremes the Religion of to-day is tending, there can be no question. It matters not where we look ; the signs all point one way, and proclaim a Kingdom which the multitude believe will come by observation. Knowledge of the true path, the healthy mean, still lingers. Theoretically, we are yet quite safe. As matter of doctrine and belief, it is admitted that the Kingdom of God is within us, and that its chief work is invisible. It is admitted, that its essential powers and attributes are spiritual, and therefore above the external mechanisms of human invention. It is conceded, that real godliness does not consist in meat and drink, or in running to and fro to watch signs and portents of God's presence manifested in the outward frame of things ; but in convictions, experiences, hopes, desires, searchings of heart, exercises of faith and repentance, which the gross eye of the world can neither see nor appreciate. It is understood that the Divine life must have its root below the surface, or be cut off from the hidden juices which feed its vigor. These facts are duly acknowledged, and in many pulpits are urged with emphasis and power. Yet they do not control the evident tendencies of the hour. The common movement is away from them. There has never been a time, not even during the period in which

individual salvation was practically regarded as a compensation for good works, when the Christianity of the people has been characterized by such excessive outwardness as now. As a current, popular manifestation, it is a thing of signs and demonstrations. It is clamorous for stimulants unworthy of a power so deep and mighty and self-centred as to render a certain stillness and reserve the only proper attitude. It is inordinately pushed and swayed by machinery whose clatter is accepted for energy, and the smoke of whose glowing axle is taken for the zeal of great wills and great hearts alive with the spirit of labor and self-sacrifice. It delights in the show, rather than the use of power; in publicity, rather than retirement. There are abundant symptoms of the feeling, that the Church will lose its hold on the people, unless, with fertile ingenuity and a careful balancing of probable results, it manage to turn out a never-failing series of sensations.

We are dealing with a tendency not, indeed, so rife in some communities as in others, but every where growing in favor. We shall note some of the more marked proofs of it, and then proceed to discuss its causes and consequences. The first proof and illustration of this tendency which we shall cite, is the eager, restless desire of the religious thought and feeling of the time to exhibit themselves in speech or in books. It is astonishing to see how many there are who believe they have a mission in this direction. It is not enough to show themselves in the sphere of active duties, where work is needed, which from its very nature must be quiet, out of the way, unseen and unknown of men. They must figure in Meetings, Assemblies and Conventions; and from the platform give law and momentum to public movements. Life is voted a dreary, monotonous level, unless it be ridged into demonstrations and sensations. Knowledge, culture, faculty, are so much dead lumber, if they cannot be rounded up into some form of display. The world is noisy; and it is felt that no one need expect an admiring recognition, who does not help on the noise. Usefulness has come to be measured by a standard so narrow and superficial, as to discourage all labor that does not promise immediate results. To commune with one's own heart and be

still, is thought to savor of the cloister and the cowl. To be silent, patient, out of sight, to toil for ends that lie far off, and which distance clothes with uncertainty, to sow beside all waters, leaving it to God to give the increase, to live and to work in the assured, tranquil confidence of faith, cheerful amid difficulties, and hopeful under failure—these are things which the pragmatism, high-pressure temper of our time turns over to people who, having no battles to fight, no issues to settle, may be left in their own grooves and corners, to dream dreams and see visions. It is no exaggeration, but simply a calm judgment resting upon signs not to be denied or mistaken, that in the hidden ballot box of public sentiment, every man is voted a drone, who does not carry a bayonet in his brain or his heart, if not upon his shoulder. The common attitude is that of assault, not forbearance. Quiet is the synonym for stagnation. Strength, of what sort soever, is doomed, if it do not show its muscle. Latent worth has few to do it reverence, and modest merit is a blank in the turbulent lottery of small prizes and small ambitions. As for the Religion which does not feed this temper, nor assert itself with a determined and impressive publicity, no one need be told how promptly it is set down as the Religion of dead Forms and obsolete Creeds.

It is easy to trace the influence upon our present Christian Literature of the popular Religion which has been moulded by this tendency. Taken as a whole, though there are some noble exceptions, it shows little evidence of power which is calm because it is ripe, thorough and patient. In much of it there is not only the absence of such power, but abundant proof of a vulgar straining after notoriety, by means of cheap sensations. It comes from minds too self-conscious, and too much bent upon the double reward of money and reputation. As an inevitable result, it lacks simplicity, depth, unction, vitality. Pumped up from cisterns, it lacks the virtue of the living fountain. It belongs to a kingdom that cometh with observation. Authorship in sacred things, which is to affect the nurture and welfare of souls, has become so cheap and common, that it has grown to be a question of audacity and assu-

rance, rather than of fitness as to who shall win its honors. We have heard persons talk of writing Stories for Children, and Books for Sunday Schools, with about as much gravity of mind and consideration of responsibility, as they would show in getting up a dinner for an important guest, or going upon a journey of pleasure. It has so entirely ceased to be a serious matter to launch a new book from the press, that we have fallen into the habit of granting pardon before it is asked, or felt to be needed, for criminal haste and superficiality. Undergraduates of Female Academies, or young men fresh from their College curriculum, who have been fortunate enough to achieve some petty success in a sentimental, popular Monthly, turn their attention, without a thought of failure, to what they consider needful additions to the current Religious Literature. With a fair command of respectable English, with some ingenuity at Story-making, with a moral to be spread over the chapters, like paint over a fresh-planed board, or to be tacked to the last page, like a tail to a kite, and with one thing more, an expression of regret from some shallow or indiscreet friend, that the Church and the world should be any longer deprived of such striking talent and pious sensibility—these things secured, they work out and offer to the public books which, if they have power enough to produce any decided effect, engender moral dyspepsia in those who are so foolish or unlucky as to read them. No considerable portion of our books for the young has yet come from such sources. We speak of a trait, a tendency in our popular Religion, which has drawn some to the surface, and which now encourages more to appear.

What is called *light Religious reading*, however respectable its sources, has reached proportions that may well excite grave apprehension. It is the exclusive growth of Modern Society and Modern Christianity. Poor seed at best, and adapted only to shallow soils, or to soils robbed of the properties for solid growths, it has been attempted to remedy the defects of quality by the universality of the sowing. The demand and the supply seem to be alike inexhaustible. We have had trial of this system of feeding the young and the old of two generations. It has been conducted upon a scale so stupendous as to

make exceptions of little practical account. We are in a condition to sum up the result, to estimate the harvest. And what are the facts? The growth and appearance of *light reading*, as a distinct branch of Religious Literature, were exactly contemporaneous with the tokens of increasing outwardness in the current manifestations of Modern Christianity. And who can doubt that it has most loyally served the tendency which gave it birth? Grave, deep, strong, earnest men, whose mental and moral fibre had been formed from the meat of Christian Doctrine, predicted what experience has shown to be true. They declared that the Church could not be over-run with such a literature, and maintain a living and profound spirituality, or a high-toned and definite Theology, commanding the cordial reverence and affectionate assent of the people. Who now doubts their wisdom? Who doubts that this deluge of *light reading*, hiding under the forms of pious thought, habits of dissipation, morbid sensibility, and indifference to sound teaching, has helped to dislodge the foundation timbers of Christian instruction and discipline? Who, as he looks out from this point of view, is not affrighted at the vast accumulation of hay, straw, and stubble, garnered up by Christian Capital and enterprise, as suitable food for our posterity? Who does not see, that such food will give us men like itself, men of wind and straw, who shall be the sport of every fresh gust of infidel thought, or fanatical zeal?

The cry has been, that the Gospel should be made easy, and be toned down to a level with the outwardness and shallowness of the popular Religion. There has been, to say the least, premature haste to answer it. The wine of pure doctrine has been freely mixed with water. Truth, once deposited in learned tractates and grave homilies, has been divided, and triturated into small doses; and these, again, have been coated with a thin varnish of fiction. Creeds and Catechisms have been diluted into jingling rhymes, and then set to Music. The Scriptures themselves have been done up into "floral beauties and sugared confections," until the original matter is well nigh buried under a mass of silly rubbish. The same drift of things has robbed preaching of much of its dignity and power. Ser-

mons, from being elaborate and learned expositions, not fearing to be set up on the naked ribs of logic; or, if not these, then searching and fervid appeals to conscience and feeling, have been turned, to a great extent, into Picture Galleries of illustration, or entertaining Essays. The strongest pulpit, in the estimation of the multitude, is that which, like a Magic Lantern, has the largest number of slides. The effect of all this is too obvious for discussion. In measuring it, our eye takes in all who profess and call themselves Christians. We see less and less of sober, solid study among Clergy and Laity. We see the Laity far more concerned about accidents of manner in the preacher, than gravity of matter. We see the Christian assembly merged into the mere audience, exercising the conventional privilege of good-humored, indifferent criticism. We see the faith of disciples sadly ravelled at the edges, or worn away by compromise, or blended with errors and infidelities, which threaten the very being of Revealed Truth. We see that the only writings, whether books or periodicals, sure of a popular run, are just those which advocate nothing unpleasant, agree with all theories, offend no sect, and adhere to no standard. Without the eye of a prophet, we might predict the ultimate fruit of all this, not only upon Religion as a System of Truth, or upon the Church as the Visible Body of Christ, but upon the Ethics of business, of Society, and of the State.

If we turn now, from the Literature to the Architecture of Religion, we shall find proofs of the same excessive and damaging outwardness, with its wonted characteristics of haste, show, tinsel and superficiality. When Churches are built, it is understood that they are intended to show forth the glory of God, and to advance His Truth among men. They stand for all that is divine and unchangeable in the world that now is. They are types and monuments of eternal realities. They represent substance, not shadow; fact, not fiction; imperishable verities, not the speculations of the fallible understanding, nor the phantoms of the dreaming imagination. As far as possible, they ought to be, in material, in style, finish and pretension, consistent with their avowed character and design. We

have a right to demand, that they should be religiously free from all manner of sham, and falsehood, and worldliness ; and that they should faithfully exemplify the immutable Truth in whose honor and for whose dissemination they were built. To appear to be what they are not, to be constructed with the intent of elaborate deception, to put forth poverty or mean economy, under the mask of riches—this is a violation of consistency and propriety, only less than that which would be wrought by actual heresy and infidelity in the living teachers installed in their pulpits.

These are principles which none will controvert or deny. And yet, turn where we will, what do we see? Why, more falsehood in consecrated Sanctuaries than in any equal number of objects built by human hands. There is sham from beginning to end, in wall, column, ceiling, arch, buttress and spire. The lines are so many threads from the loom of deception ; the coloring counterfeits the solidities of nature ; and the artificial blocking tells with impotent mimicry of quarries which have never been touched or thought of. Architects, Clergymen, Vestrymen, people ignoring the common necessities of strength and durability, set themselves at work to secure a kind and degree of ornamentation which, at the least possible expense, shall embody the largest possible number of untruths. To cover up the conscious hollowness, they carve, paint, and plaster, until Truth shrinks from its own intended abode, and is profaned at its own acknowledged shrine. Stone gives way to stucco ; the real vault, to the painted one ; walnut, to stained pine ; the gold and silver Altar Service, to plated-ware—and this, in a gift formally and deliberately set apart to the honor and glory Him Who abhors deceit ; Who has sent His Son to drive from the world the father of lies ; Who claims the lamb without blemish, and the first fruits in their perfection for His Altar ! How many Churches thus rounded into completion by moulders in plaster, and painters in fresco, are pronounced by the passing multitude “of chaste and elegant design.” How many building-Committees and congregations are congratulated by Chief Shepherds upon such results of blended ingenuity and meanness !

Thus the noblest and richest of the Arts is driven from its position, as the chosen handmaid of saving Truth, its mighty inspirations stifled, and itself degraded to the unwilling service of the common enemy of God and man. It all comes of a life which has travelled too far from its root, and has grown top-heavy with surface expansion. This kind of vanity, affectation and falsehood, is only one cluster out of many ripened upon the diseased vine. Religious taste has ceased to be candid, and simple, and upright, in proportion as the common development has let go the more still and profound sources of spiritual power.

This fact is capable of indefinite application to all branches of Art, so far as they are affected by the popular Religion of the time. It fully explains much of the admitted poverty of Modern Art, in all the higher walks of imaginative creation. Genius, whether handling the chisel, the pencil, or the pen, has grown weak and barren, with only a brittle hold on greatness, as it has forsaken the mysteries and inspirations of the Cross, and parted from the simple, trusting, intense faith of earlier days. The path that leads to power, stretches away from the shallow denials and blatant skepticisms of the hour. The secret of strength is with them only, who, as little children, look up, with trusting innocence and dependent love, to Him Who would make earth be, what Heaven is.

But there are other proofs of the present undue outwardness of our current Religion. No one can have failed to notice the prevailing passion for Religious statistics. What is now called an active Christianity, must have its arithmetic, its journals, ledgers and tables. Schemes of Religious effort which cannot make periodical returns in figures, fail to command the public confidence. Missions, Charities, and Reform movements, which do not meet this test, must be abandoned. Silent, patient, steadfast labor is at a discount. It is felt that we are beating the air, if every blow is not instantly followed by an audible reverberation. The vast majority of Christians decide whether a Mission succeeds, or fails, by the number of heathen converted in a given period. The power and worth of the several Denominations are measured by the printed Reports of

what they have done. This Christian Body is weak, because its figures are small. That Christian Body is strong, because its figures are large. Their faith, their history, their polity and internal life—these, as tests of strength and usefulness, are practically ignored. Qualities and results are valued only as they come with observation and bear the impress of palpable signs.

The same temper appears in the universal fondness for Societies, Associations, and all possible modes of voluntary combination. Old duties must put on new faces, and be done in new ways. Objects old as Christianity itself, and falling within the great design for which the Church was instituted, must be reached by new inventions, which shall save labor and time, and provide pleasant surprises of success. It is expected, that the work of propagating God's Truth will be made easier, by the methods and subdivisions which have carried manufacturing industry to such astonishing perfection. Many utterly fail to comprehend why the Church is not amenable to the rules which govern the rate of increase in a Factory. Given, so much capital, so much labor, so much material, so much brains; given, so many Clergy, so many Churches, Societies, stations, books, printing-presses,—it is felt, that we ought to be able to predict and secure returns definitely proportionate to the means invested. Experience, indeed, every day exposes the gross folly of such thinking. But, instead of growing wiser, people seem to lose faith in the cause itself. They treat the Church and the Gospel as a dry mechanism of visible wheels and pulleys, and are astonished at the failure of their management. As well attempt to make the sun grind in a mill, or the sea to bind itself down to the trip-hammer's task. It is forgotten, that in spiritual things power does not grow with the multiplication of levers, or even of hands to work them. It is forgotten, that the Church, when truly great, is so, not through Societies, but through the free forces of single wills, as moved by the energies and inspirations of the Divine Life. Ordinarily, Societies are the creations of secondary forces. If not in their inception, then in their subsequent history, they attempt to do, by external combination, what can be done only by an

intense life in the individual heart. Platforms, Schemes, Reports, Public Meetings, large promises, well-drilled Boards of Managers, impressive appeals, startling announcements of the existing urgency—these they offer as a kind of substitute for qualities in the spiritual man, which have grown indolent, or gone to decay. More care is given to the shell, in proportion as it proves hollow. Great pains must be lavished on the dam that gathers its waters from a failing or capricious stream.

We do not wish to disparage associated effort, or to question the value of organized movements, where they are living growths out of a life strong enough to hold them in their place. What we do condemn, is, the unhealthy and excessive reliance upon them, which, in effect, converts them into lame and impotent substitutes for the Church's organic life, and the spiritual virtues of individual character. We can recall names in the past, who, could they return and move among us in their old orbits of fire, would be worth more to the great ends of Christ's Kingdom, than all the Boards, Committees, and Societies now in existence. But, any word of this sort, we are aware, will be set down as a flourish of rhetoric. And, doubtless, among those who have been domiciled so long in the central bureaux of ecclesiastical management, as to lose all relish for freshness, fervor and liberty, this whole view will be considered sentimental, visionary, unpractical.

Passing over the publicity which characterizes the prevalent benevolence of the time, we shall note but one more indication of the tendency now under examination. There is nothing, perhaps, in which the moral habit and taste of an age are more clearly discernible, than in the class of virtues which chiefly attract admiration. Among us, without question, it is the more demonstrative virtues, those which soonest catch the eye and the ear, and live on the surface of affairs. Courage, energy, boldness, determination, singleness of will, ardor, and kindred traits, are the favorites. We love most what most assures victory, enterprise, advancement, prestige. Whoever exhibits these, will find his vices tenderly handled, if not charitably overlooked. It is not meant, that we are insensible to the grace and loveliness of the more quiet and passive vir-

tues of submission, patience, meekness, gentleness ; but only that they have no chance in competing for popular favor. It is action, not suffering, that wins from the Religion of to-day the loudest plaudits. It is the one who rushes to the front to strike, not the one who remains behind to endure, that lays hold upon the common heart. This is apparent in nearly all whom the general suffrage has elevated into leaders, heroes, idols. They are, uniformly, those who attack wrong, not those who patiently suffer it ;—men of conflict and resistance, not men of obedience.

Thus far we have discussed our subject only as to its evidences and manifestations. Let us now turn to its causes. There is among us an evident sympathy of Religious with Physical activity. Whatever else may be doubtful in this age, it is certain that no period of the world has witnessed such a stupendous advance in Material power and wealth, or such an array of outside activities. The world's pace has been quickened. What were once impossibilities, have become facts. Dreams have passed into realities. Changes so amazing have been wrought as to leave little to wonder at in the bounds of human achievement. This age is, beyond all comparison, an age of stupendous results, as well as stupendous agencies. Now, the life which men live in the flesh, and the life they live in the Spirit, lie close together. Radically different, yet they have their points of contact, their modes of intercommunication ; and great movements cannot occur in the one, without affecting the other. It is easy to transfer to the inner and more hidden sphere, what has been learned in the outer and more palpable one. Habits of thought, frames of mind, dominant tempers, wherever and however built up, often follow us where they were not meant to go. Thus, our Religion, by sympathy, by intercourse, by unconscious imitation, has assumed the prevailing Physical characteristics of the time. It is impulsive, excitable, bustling, pragmatismal, demonstrative, energetic, eager for change, thirsting after novelty. Where it works, it will have a tangible result at once, or stop. It will cast its bread upon the waters, but will not do it a second time, if the waves in sight do not roll back the returns. Its

accumulated facilities, its multiplied powers and splendid opportunities, tolerate neither waste of faculty, nor uncertainty of triumph. The enterprise that levels mountains, fills up valleys, and bridges arms of the sea in the world of matter, is impatient of lower achievements in the empire of Spiritual Truth.

Another cause contributing to the undue outwardness of popular Religion, is the energy and prevalence of the Sect-Spirit. Christendom appears like a disorderly aggregate of Parties, Schools, and colliding Sects. Space would fail us, were we only to cite their names and peculiarities. But we may not touch the solemn question of the Schismatic rending of the Body of Christ, save as it is connected with the evil now under discussion. On this its bearing is plain. Once started, each Sect strives to perpetuate itself, to become a power, to have a history. Sects have the intense individuality which begets competition. Their life becomes almost a passion to excel every rival candidate for public favor. They are quick to assert and to display their supposed advantages. To prove these, they may rely more or less upon argument and controversial comparisons; but their main reliance is upon their growth and power. So the same motive which stimulates them to rivalry, tempts a constant appeal to numbers and results, which are the only evidences of strength and prosperity acknowledged by the secular judgment. Now the temptation to this sort of appeal issues in the kindred temptation to swell as much as possible the figures which set forth their condition. The consequences of this are patent to every eye. In this hot race for strength and superiority, there are sometimes seen exhibitions of coarse and intemperate zeal, tolerable only in the market-place, where dealers bid against each other for customers. This feeling is carried to a most censurable degree, in recruiting for Sunday Schools. The strife in this direction is so sharp, that rewards and bonuses in money are freely used to buy up young recruits. Things, indeed, have come to such a pass, that children are occasionally found who, when invited to join a particular School, at once ask how much they are to get for joining; and, if the terms are too low, they reply in a

business-like way, that they can do better elsewhere. To such fruits we may add more serious evils ;—the hurried and incautious admission of new members ; the relaxation of discipline ; the search for money in all ways, and from all sources, to build Churches which may not be needed ; or to decorate Churches with gaudy and superfluous ornamentation, which look better in their unadorned simplicity ; the intense and often reckless desire to proselyte ; but, chiefly and generally, the grave vanity of display ; the ambition to be thought the foremost and the strongest. Such are the plain leanings of the Sect-spirit. It is the ally of bigotry, narrowness, shallowness, formalism, and artificiality. It belongs essentially to a Kingdom which cometh with observation, not to that which is within.

Another cause, tending to make our Religion unduly an outward thing,—a cause, too, close connected with the life of Sects,—is the unhealthy prominence of the individual Christian, as compared with the organized whole of the faithful. We do not seem to have, in wholesome measure, the gift of working in and with the Church, as we should. We either reject the moulding power of its organic life, or else accept it in such way as to subvert private rights, and swallow up the individual. From both errors, there results a Religion all the while tending to the surface ; spreading in the branches, at the expense of the root ; a Religion of cant ; or, a Religion of sensuous pomp, and inordinate ritualism. Puritanism illustrates the one, and Popery the other. But, clearly, in our Reformed Catholic Christianity, the individual is too much for himself ; too conspicuous in the System which ought to direct him. The individual is tempted, just as the Sect is tempted. He labors too much for the sake of a large credit. He feels the influence of competition. He has a figure to make. He must manage to be felt and looked up to, or he will be rated a cypher ; so his life works upward, until it diffuses itself in the grateful sunshine of public appreciation. He prays, he counsels, he meditates, he does alms, and all, because they are duties ; yet not without a careful estimate of their present profit to his reputation among men.

Finally, as this is an unusual age, in many particulars, so is it especially in regard to its extraordinary facilities for giving publicity to what, in other periods, has, to a considerable degree, been obliged to remain private. Books, Periodicals, Reports, Newspapers,—to furnish matter for these which shall make them useful, interesting and influential, has become a leading interest in the world of intellect and capital. No small amount of their current material is drawn from Religious sources, and relates to Religious concerns. The Church, as well as all other spheres of activity, is searched for items of interest. Thus, Parish Ministers grow to be public men before they know it; and Congregations, in their most important affairs, act not without reference to what will be said of them in the Daily Papers. Taken as a whole, neither Clergy nor Parishes have been backward in availing themselves of such facilities to make known their labors and attractions. The advertising columns of the Daily Press present a voluminous, if not an edifying commentary on this point. There are evidently some lights that do not mean to be quenched, if printer's ink will keep them alive. There are not a few Congregations that believe in the virtue of keeping before the public. The education, the experience, the habits of the tradesman, have not been lost upon them. If Railroads, Hotels, Theatres, Nostrums, and Patents find such immense advantage in the free use of Bill-posting and Newspapers, why should it be otherwise with the interests of Religion? Certainly this expedient does bring members, money, and cheap prestige. But who doubts the ultimate damage it inflicts? Who doubts that the spiritual tone of that people will sink lower and lower, who are conscious of being, or of struggling to be, constantly in the public eye? Such ostentation, such itching for popularity or notoriety, is at war with the highest motives and rewards addressed to the Christian heart. It breeds distaste for retirement. It overlays the more quiet and profound sources of power. It tempts Ministers and Congregations to work, not by faith, but by the common rules and instincts of secular calculation, and by the stimulus of the reporter's pen.

Though we have already more or less fully indicated some of the evils of this unhealthy outwardness of Popular Religion, we beg to recapitulate them, and to state some others of a less obvious and immediate nature. This trait of our current Christianity produces vanity and self-sufficiency, in the individual and in the Church. It induces a withdrawal of sympathy, offerings, and coöperation, unless there is promise of corresponding notoriety. It degrades and adulterates the motives to Christian conduct. It introduces wordly stimulants and wordly methods into unworldly interests. It makes personal religion superficial, dramatic, and formal. It leads us away from the only sure and unfailing sources of spiritual strength. It fatally undermines our conception of Christianity as a Spiritual System, designed to work by Spiritual means, and for Spiritual ends. It drags the Kingdom of God down to a level with the kingdoms of this world, in respect to temper, policy, and means of advancement. And, generally, it dulls and confounds the sense of the Supernatural, as the dominant and distinguishing element of the whole Scheme of Redemption; and so prepares the way for all possibilities of Skepticism. Under its influence, Christians will value less and less the meaning and efficacy of the Sacraments, as Signs, Channels, and pledges of Spiritual Grace. They will see, in them, appeals to the memory, the imagination, the intellect, the senses; but they will no longer regard them as Divinely instituted Means of Supernatural communion with their Author. This feeling in regard to the Sacraments, will gradually develop into habitual impatience of every thing in the whole range of Revealed Truth, that is hidden, impalpable, and Divine. Thus, we shall soon drift into a state of things which will renew the old folly of the race, the attempt to do for masses of moral beings, by outward Systems, what can be done only by the inward power of Regeneration, and the presence of the Holy Ghost,—ending in the triumph of a gross and defiant Naturalism, and the enthronement of the powers of the world upon the ruins of Christianity.

The Church, centuries ago, had experience of a morbidly introversive, self-consumed, self-buried life,—a life so still and inward, so severed from wholesome uses and relations without, as to end in torpor, laziness, shallowness, and carnality,—a whited sepulchre, whose silence was the proof of dead men within. Now, she is menaced with the same or kindred evils, from the opposite extreme. The forces which sweep outward, and the forces which tend downward to the central heart, are quite as much out of balance, as they were five hundred years ago. There is, on all sides, the din of preparation for great harvests, after shallow plowing. Life at the centre has not been deepened, while all external activities have been indefinitely expanded. Christians are more busy, and less devout. They multiply labors, but fall away in the energy of a still and secret life with God. They are more with each other, and less with Christ; oftener on the platform, than at the Cross; more abundant in schemes for doing good, than in the precious dew of God's Grace falling upon them in mystery and power. It remains to be seen, whether the Church will allow herself to be thrown by this tendency upon another period of reaction, laden with struggle, chaos and death; or whether, alive to the danger, she will, through the Word and Spirit, speaking in Discipline, Worship, Preaching, and the example of the faithful, supply the needed remedy.

ART. VI.—AMERICAN LUTHERANISM AND THE EPISCOPACY.

DR. REYNOLDS' REASONS FOR LEAVING THE LUTHERAN CHURCH.

THE Rev. W. M. Reynolds, D. D., a prominent Lutheran Clergyman, has already become a Candidate for Holy Orders in the Diocese of Illinois, and is passing the prescribed time before his admission to the Diaconate. As in the case of the Rev. Dr. Huntington on his leaving the Unitarians, a man of so much distinction and influence, of such acknowledged moral and intellectual worth, as Dr. Reynolds, could not take such a decided and important step, without rousing the attention of the leaders of the denomination from which he was thus so solemnly and officially separating himself. Some of these gentlemen attacked Dr. Reynolds in one of their papers, *The (Philadelphia) Lutheran and Missionary*, in a manner which seemed to call for a reply; and the Dr., in doing so, has drawn a picture of the present condition of the Lutheran denomination in this country, which we wish to place before the readers of *The American Quarterly Church Review*. We therefore reprint the Reply entire.

It is evident that there is, at the present time, a great movement going on in this country, we will not say toward, but in respect to, Church Unity; on which we have a few words to say. That movement is soon to become more prominent, and to assume new and more commanding proportions. Everything betokens this. The numbers of young and middle-aged Clergymen of the various denominations, who are seeking Orders in the Church, or are giving intimation of their intention to do so; the confessions made, again and again, by Clergymen in advanced years among them, that if they were to commence life again, they would enter the Ministry of the Protestant Episcopal Church; the palpable fact that, under the influence of

our Educational, Social, and Civil Institutions, such things as Creeds and Confessions are fast losing their hold upon the people, and that they are rapidly and most certainly drifting into Indifferentism, and then, into open and avowed Infidelity—all this leaves no doubt as to the position which the Church occupies, and is to occupy, on this Continent. May she have grace and wisdom equal to the emergency.

Our duty is clear. The Church's "strength is to sit still;" yet, only as Israel's strength was, to sit still. The Church is to "stand still, and see the salvation of the Lord;" and yet, she is to stand still, only as the Israelites stood still. Her power is, in that masterly inactivity which comes from a true perception and faithful discharge of her high and holy mission, in such an age and nation as ours. There must be no time-serving, no shallow empiricism, no underbidding of the marketplace, and no temporizing policy. As the drift sets in toward the Church, she will need that indomitable firmness and wise discretion, which are not of this world. Numbers are not always strength; they may be weakness. *Cælum non animum mutant qui trans mare currunt.* True Churchmanship, like the Prayer Book itself, is a growth, not an instantaneous creation; it is a character, not a profession; it has elements in it which cannot be counterfeited, and which the popular religionism of the day cannot produce. If, therefore, as the tide sets strongly Churchward, the Ministers of the Sects were, in great numbers, to come into the Church, with all the ignorance of her claims, with the self-conceit, the self-will, the pharisaical intermeddling, the arrogant and denunciatory tone and temper, the popular conception of the very nature of the Christian Life and Christian evidence, which characterize the Sect-spirit of our times and country, these men would neither be happy nor useful in the Church; and, like Ralston and Parsons, of Kentucky, they would soon return whence they came out, certainly to the Church's benefit, if not their own. The Church is what she is, a tower of strength, standing firm and unshaken amidst the wild, turbulent passions and commotions of the times, simply because there is that in her and about her, with which such men do not and cannot sympathize. They might

grow into a knowledge and appreciation of the Church, if they would consent, first to unlearn many of their long-cherished views and apprehensions of the deep things of God and of His Truth.

Just now, the denominations about us are approaching Church Clergymen with a new method. They come, in the apparently ingenuous attitude of learners. They wish to be informed, they say, what the Church theory of Unity really is. Have some of these gentlemen forgotten what they thought about Church Unity, as it affects the Protestant Episcopal Church, when, a few years ago, they set a certain Mr. Shimeall to write and publish that scurrilous book on the Church, and then gave to that book their written recommendation? Now, they come, as gentle as cooing doves, and would be under the greatest obligations, if our Clergy would only allow themselves to be "counted in," in a certain Series of Lectures; and would occupy certain pulpits, and would preach on the subject of Church Unity! If these gentlemen really wish to know what the doctrine of Church Unity is, it may, perhaps, be well enough to tell them, frankly and kindly; although, really, the sources of authentic information are already abundant. If, on the other hand, their object is to get our Clergy to give, in the estimation of the people, a *quasi* recognition of their Orders and Systems, by appearing officially in such a position—that is quite another question.* *Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes.*

But we return to the reply of Dr. Reynolds. We are glad to say, that the language of caution and distrust, which we have felt bound to use, has no pertinence or application whatever to the case before us. The Dr. shows that he understands clearly the question on which he was called to act, and

* The Presbyterian *New York Observer* of March 3d, has the following significant Editorial:—

"SERMONS ON CHRISTIAN UNION.—Rev. Dr. Gardiner Spring will preach, in the Series on Christian Union, in St. Paul's Methodist Episcopal Church, next Sunday morning. Rev. Dr. Dix, of Trinity Church, will present 'Thoughts on the loss of Visible Unity in Christ's Church, and steps necessary to recover the same,' in the Broadway Tabernacle, on the 2d Sunday in March. This series will be continued by prominent Clergymen on the principle of an interchange of pulpits and services, in the hope of thereby promoting, among the Clergy and Laity, the spirit of Christian unity."

that he has acted conscientiously and in the fear of God. The larger the accessions from such men the better. As Churchmen, we give them fraternal greeting with a warm heart, and bid them God speed. There is a great work in our country for them to do. If they find faithlessness, and indifference, and spiritual torpor in this Branch of Christ's One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, let them not be disappointed. Surely, "her foundations are upon the holy hills." There are multitudes of earnest men within her Fold, and that number is increasing, who "see eye to eye;" and "the Most High shall stablish her." Our belief long has been, that a considerable portion of the German Reformed and the Lutheran denominations, which have clung with such tenacity to the Sacramental features of the Church, must, to be consistent with themselves, and will, sooner or later, return to that Apostolic Ministry, which, at the Reformation, they unintentionally lost. We do not see how conscientious men can, or dare, separate what God hath, beyond a peradventure, joined together. The following is the Reply of Dr. Reynolds:—

REASONS FOR LEAVING THE LUTHERAN CHURCH.

HAVING withdrawn from the Lutheran Church *partly* on account of its wide-spread divisions and violent controversies, I am naturally averse to transferring anything of that character into the relations which I have just formed with the Episcopal Church. Hence I have allowed to pass unnoticed, various assaults that have been made upon me in sundry papers professing to represent the Lutheran Church, especially the *Lutheran and Missionary*, published in Philadelphia, Penn. But the last number of the paper just named has an article of so virulent a character, from its Pittsburg editor, Dr. Passavant, and so evidently designed to place the Church with which I have united, as well as myself, in a false position, that it seems due to the cause of truth to correct its utter misrepresentations.

The first point raised by Dr. Passavant in this article is, that I left the Lutheran Church because I was dissatisfied, or considered myself badly treated, in regard to the editorship of

a projected newspaper, some two or three years since. That I was rather shabbily treated by Dr. Passavant and his associates, in that matter, is true, as any one may satisfy himself by a careful reading even of his own version of the matter. But it was a small affair, except as characteristic of those engaged in it; and so far from being a ruling motive with me in my action, taken months, I might say years, afterwards, is only cause of devout gratitude to God that I was not permitted to occupy a position for which I feel more deeply, I am sure, than any of those gentleman can, that I am not fitted. Yes, I thank God that I am not fitted, either by nature or by habit, to do the work that the *Lutheran and Missionary* is doing for narrow and bitter sectarianism, and in denouncing its brethren of the same communion, men who stand at the head of its literary and theological institutions and occupy the highest rank in its Ministry, as "dishonest," "shameless," "pirates," "a disgrace to the name we bear," &c., &c., as may be seen in any number of that paper for a month past. Far from cherishing malice against them on that account, I thank Dr. Passavant and his colleagues for the complimentary judgment, that it required a man of "sterner stuff" than I am, for such a work.

But, in reply to this defamation and aspersion of my motives, I would merely remind Dr. Passavant, that it is a very stale, Jesuitical trick, that has been repeated very frequently for the last three hundred years, since it was first charged upon the great Reformer, that he withdrew from the Church of Rome, because the profitable sale of indulgences was committed to John Tetzel rather than to Martin Luther.

Still more serious, however, is the charge, that I enter the Episcopal Church as an avowed contemner of her Articles of Faith, and that in this I am encouraged by one of her Bishops and clergy. This is not said just in so many words, but it is the implication of statements in regard to conversations, &c., represented as having been held with me, by certain persons not named. Having nothing to conceal, I am free to acknowledge that a remark of mine, made in the freedom of a private conversation, and based upon a misapprehension by me of a historical statement then recently made to me by a distinguished divine of the Episcopal Church, gives some color to this mis-

representation. But that remark implied no disrespect of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, or of their recension as adopted by the Church in the United States, either upon my part, or that of the gentleman whose remarks I partially misunderstood.

It is also true, that in statements of my doctrinal views to the Bishop and clergy of Illinois, with whom I have conversed upon these subjects, I have unhesitatingly avowed my accordance with the great evangelical doctrines of the Lutheran Church, as set forth in the Augsburg Confession. But neither they nor I regard this as derogatory to the authority of the Thirty-nine Articles, which all the standard authorities of the Church of England declare to be based upon and essentially accordant with the Augsburg Confession, the points wherein they differ being such as are open questions in the liberal system of the Episcopal Church.

That I formerly took a different view of the relations of the Episcopal to the Lutheran Church, I freely admit; but, at the same time, I entertained very different views of the doctrines of the Lutheran Church also. Looking over the whole field of my movement in theological opinion, I find that I have approximated to the Episcopal Church just as I have to the Lutheran—that the same arguments which reconcile me doctrinally with the one, do the same with the other. Nor has my opposition ever been stronger to the doctrines of the Episcopal Church than to those of the Lutheran. A careful study of the highest authorities in each Church, satisfies me alike of their original and essential agreement, and is to me a new argument for the validity of the conclusions at which I have arrived.

But it is alleged against me, that I have greatly changed my views in regard to Episcopacy, as a system of Church government. I cannot deny it; but I pray my Lutheran friends to consider that the state of things in the Lutheran Church of this country, has driven me to these conclusions. Although Dr. Passavant intimates that I have been involved in controversy in various parts of the Lutheran Church, he cannot deny that those controversies were not of my making, and that,

from my earliest connection with the Church, I labored to promote its unity and union, both internal and external. But after studying this problem for many long and weary years, I have finally given it up in despair, so far as the present organization of the Lutheran Church in the United States is concerned. It is an indisputable fact, that the dissensions and divisions of the Lutheran Church, instead of diminishing, are increasing and extending from year to year. The doctrinal, as well as the organic (synodical) difference becomes greater and more strongly marked. Twenty years since doctrinal differences were scarcely noticed. The difference between the General Synod and its opponents was chiefly that of organization, and greater or less activity in works of Christian benevolence. Now, however, parties are more violent and antagonistic in the General Synod than they ever were out of it, as witness the weekly invectives of the *Lutheran* and *Observer* against each other, each, meanwhile, claiming to be the organ of public sentiment in the General Synod. In that body there are at least three sharply defined parties, and outside of it six or seven more, each with a synodical organization of its own, and generally as hostile to all other Synods as it is to the General Synod.

In this I fail to see the first elements of Christian organic life—*unity, brotherly love, efficiency*. There is in it no response to the sacerdotal prayer of the Great Head of the Church, as recorded in St. John's Gospel, xvii. 21, "*That they all may be one, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent me.*" I do not deny, I do not doubt, that there are many Christian men and women in the Lutheran Church, deeply penetrated with the spirit of Christ, and true members of His Mystical Body. But they do not show it externally whilst they "*bite and devour one another*"—the inevitable tendency of which is, instead of edifying each other in love, to "*consume,*" and destroy "*one another.*" To what else, also, are we to attribute the immense losses of the Lutheran Church in members and material—whole families, congregations and generations, going into other denominations? The feeble life of their Schools, Colleges, and Theological Seminaries, Missions, and charitable operations? I can account for all this only by

these fatal dissensions and distractions, misgovernment and anarchy—in a word, the want of a central power to give unity and direction to the movements of the Church. Such a power, I take it, is Episcopacy.

Nor is this an idea, or power, foreign to Lutheranism. The declarations of the Augsburg Confession are clear upon this point:—"We do not propose to deprive the Bishops of their power," is its well known expression. Swedert and Denmark have always retained the Episcopate, and Germany has again and again endeavored to restore it. The earliest sympathies of the Lutheran Church of this country were also with their Episcopal brethren. The first Churches that required English preaching, the Swedes upon the Delaware, called in Episcopal ministers to their assistance. A formal resolution of the New York German Ministerium is well known to have recommended its English members, requiring English preaching, to go to Episcopal churches. A still closer union was formed between the Lutherans and Episcopalians in North Carolina. A son of Mühlenberg, the patriarch of American Lutheranism, was ordained by the Bishop of London for the Lutheran churches in Virginia. Was not that the natural flow of Lutheran sympathies? And why should they not again take the same direction?

So, too, in regard to the forms of Worship. Those Lutheran Churches that have used an English Liturgy, have always incorporated with it more or less of the Book of Common Prayer; and I doubt not that if the English congregations were consulted, all those who desire a liturgy would decidedly prefer the forms of the Episcopal Church to any that have heretofore been presented to them. Such, at least, is my own conclusion, after the careful study and use of the Episcopal forms of worship, for a considerable period of time.

Such, also, are the leading causes which have determined my transition to the Episcopal Church—the distractions, divisions, bitter controversies and hopeless struggles in which the Lutheran Church is involved—the accordance of the system of doctrine which I had there embraced with that maintained by the Episcopal Church of the United States, and my preference for

its forms of worship—and above all, my conviction that the system of government maintained by the Episcopal Church, is the proper corrective for the weakness and anarchical tendencies of the Lutheranism of the United States.

In these conclusions, I should be very glad to have my friends in the Lutheran Church, with whom I have been so long associated, united with me. But if that cannot be, I am confident that they will not deny me the right to exercise my own judgment, and carry out my conscientious convictions, although these may differ very widely from their own. Of this they have already given me the most satisfactory assurances, both publicly and privately; so that I am satisfied that the *Lutheran and Missionary* represents only the more narrow sectarianism of the illustrious name with which it is associated. Very different is the tone of the *Lutheran Observer*, of Baltimore, the oldest and most widely circulated paper in the Lutheran Church, and whose kindly notice of my change of ecclesiastical relations has drawn down upon it, as well as upon myself, the most unmeasured abuse from the *Lutheran and Missionary*. Having had no communication of any kind whatever with the Editors of the *Observer*, since my decision was made in regard to my relations to the Episcopal Church, until after the publication of these charges of the lowest and most paltry motives were fulminated against them by the Philadelphia paper, it is only necessary that I should state this fact as a sufficient answer to all such misrepresentations. Incredible, however, as it may appear to the Editors of the *Lutheran and Missionary*, such liberal sentiment, and Christian courtesy, and warmth of private friendship, are only what those who have ever known them would naturally expect from the present proprietors and editors of the *Lutheran Observer*—Drs. Stork, Diehl and Conrad. To these, and all my other friends in the Lutheran Church, with whom I have been so many years associated in the same labors for what we believed to be the most sacred interests of the Lutheran Church, as well as of our common Christianity, I need give no assurance of my unchanged regard; only begging them to believe, that in the new relations which I have formed, I am actuated by the same love of truth and

devotion to what appears to me to be right and duty, for which they have heretofore given me credit, and that I shall never cease to pray that we, and all Christ's true disciples upon earth, may yet "*see eye to eye*," and act as members of that "one Holy Church which is the Communion of Saints."

W. M. REYNOLDS.

Chicago, Ill., Oct. 26, 1863.

The (Baltimore) *Lutheran Observer*, in its notice of Dr. Reynolds' transition, is in such gentlemanly contrast to the attack of the *Lutheran and Missionary*, that we are glad to place its language on record:—

"His withdrawal to the Episcopal Church was a real loss to us. He was one of our most accomplished scholars, and had been long devoted to the best interests of the Lutheran Church. He had collected most valuable material for a first-rate history of our Church in this country; he is, perhaps, the best-informed man in English hymnology that we have among us; he had most thoroughly studied all the great and vital Church questions that are now agitated, and will have to be settled before the American Lutheran Church can rise and shine; he has occupied some of the most honorable and responsible positions in our institutions of learning. The withdrawal of such a man from the ministry of any Church is a great loss. We regretted that it should happen at the very time when his friends had started the project of providing the means of placing him at the head of one of our important seats of learning. But Dr. Reynolds has merely exercised a right which we all concede, and he has not forfeited any claim to our respect and fraternal regard."

ART. VII.—PRIVATE MUNIFICENCE IN PARISHES, AND
CHURCH CHARITIES.

“THE Ministers should not omit earnestly to move such sick persons as are of ability, to be liberal to the poor. But men should often be put in remembrance to take order for the settling of their temporal estates, while they are in health.”—*Rubric for Visitation of the Sick.*

A well written Tract upon the pecuniary affairs of Parishes, and upon Church Charities in general, viewed in their moral and religious aspects, would meet a pressing want, and might be circulated with advantage. One matter to be considered therein would be, that of private or individual munificence, in the erection of Churches and endowing them, or in endowing Charitable Institutions.

Our Holy Religion has ever been greatly indebted, under God, for her successes and advantages, to the princely liberality of her men of wealth. Many are the familiar instances of this recorded in the Bible. In the Dark Ages, so called, Old England, with a population of 2,000,000, was proportionately better supplied with houses of worship, and of a better character, than she now is, with a ten-fold increase of inhabitants and of wealth, and, for the advantage in those early years, was mainly indebted to the liberality of rich laymen and ecclesiastics. To the same source may be traced many of her noble endowments for Schools, Colleges, and Hospitals; and, indeed, thus it is throughout Europe. No doubt Romanism fostered a wrong spirit, in encouraging such acts as works meriting salvation, yet, we trust, better motives often actuated the liberal giver. It is true, also, that the greater private liberality of those days, was partly owing to the fact that wealth was in fewer hands, and, of course, could be disbursed only by the few; and partly, also, to the changes made by commerce, which has opened many channels for the use of money, and led to a luxury of living formerly unknown. Whatever the causes or motives, the good remains; and throughout the old countries, edifices and endowments, the fruits of private liberality,

.

that have continued century after century, are richly scattered, and still remain to bless our age and times.

We are not without like instances of individual munificence, in modern times, and in our own land, and, happily, they are on the increase. It is becoming more and more common to hear of the gift of thousands and tens of thousands for religious purposes, of costly Churches erected entirely at the expense of one person, of Professorships and Scholarships, and even Colleges, founded in the same way, and of large donations and bequests for Missions. They are mentioned with high commendation, and are ever encouraged, yet have we need of caution, lest, dazzled by the splendor of the gift, we jump too hastily to the conclusion that such munificence is always and every way desirable. We are not now, indeed, very liable to the error of having such charities performed to merit salvation, although ostentation may very likely have its influence in prompting them; nor, we confess, is there any very great danger of a superfluity of this kind of charity, in this worldly age. And yet, granting the purity of motive, and the Christian liberality of these acts, we assert that there are often evils in the mode or conditions of the gift, that almost destroy its value, and, not unfrequently, render it even pernicious in its abiding influences. These modern acts of munificence lack one advantage of those of olden times; for then the spirit of submission to priestly guidance had, at least, this merit, that the gift would be likely to take the form most serviceable to the Church, and have the wisdom of more than one head in its direction; while now there is often nothing but individual judgment or caprice to guide in its bestowal. Wisely does the Church, in the Rubrics of the Visitation Office, make it the duty of the Minister "to admonish such sick persons as are of ability, to be liberal to the poor, and to put men, while in health, in remembrance of their duty,"—yet, from the delicacy of such interference, the fear of being suspected of interested motives, the jealousy of heirs, and the sensitiveness of the dying, and even of the well, to all such conversation, there is reason to apprehend that the Rubrics are almost a dead letter. Some general suggestions, applicable in all cases, free from the

suspicion of selfish aims and local prejudices, for the consideration of men of property while in health, as well as for the sick, seem to us desirable, and a few will here be offered.

It may be questioned whether the building of a Church by a wealthy individual, for a congregation, able, in whole or in part, to build for themselves, is a wise expenditure, or any charity at all. To do it for a poor neighborhood, or on missionary ground, would be commendable; but why help those who can, and if properly appealed to, will help themselves? It is a settled principle that charities, to those who can do without them, are positively injurious. To give even a Bible, or Prayer Book, to one who is able and willing to pay for it, or to pay something towards it, is found in the experience of distributors, to be not wise. The people of a wealthy neighborhood ought, when the offer of a Church, as a free gift, is made to them, to say as David did to Araunah, "I will not serve my God of that which cost me nothing." Providing a place of Public Worship, and sustaining Services therein, is a duty laid by God on each person, according to his ability, nor is it any kindness to him to remove the divinely-imposed obligation. Religious privileges will always be more highly valued by those who pay for them, in full, Scriptural measure, and, no doubt, God will more abundantly bless the Means of Grace to those who are not niggardly in supporting them. Therefore if there be a man of wealth, with largeness of heart to erect a Church at his own cost, and one be needed in his neighborhood, his wiser and more Christian course would be, first to draw out measurably the resources of all interested in the movement, and to use his purposed offering as a motive to encourage their's, and to add perfectness and comfort to the sacred edifice, beyond what their gifts would have secured. A congregation, with such leading and aid, could easily erect a substantial House of God, with the satisfaction and blessing of having done their part in rearing it, while the rich man would have, not indeed the ostentatious, or even the humbly grateful feeling, of worshipping in a Church built at his own cost; but of having done the people a great service, in the uprearing of a

House of Prayer in the way most Scriptural and most profitable for all ; and instead of being among them as a patron, a name often odious, would be a fellow-laborer beloved. It was in this manner that the Tabernacle was built. So David and Solomon drew out the people's offerings, with their own, for the Temple ; and so was the second Temple erected. The House of God, at Jerusalem, be it remembered, too, was rather a national affair, and, therefore, rightly built and sustained by the revenues of the nation ; yet did individual munificence lead the way, while the gifts of all, even the poorest, were invited. Herod's Temple was probably at his sole cost ; but that was no pattern for the Christian, whether we regard the motives of the giver, the character of the receivers, or the seeming blessing that rested on the gift. Of the deed of him of whom it was said, "he loveth our nation, and hath built us a Synagogue," we know too little to pronounce any judgment. The clearly marked Scriptural rule and example discourage that private munificence which spares the people from contributing according to the ability given of God.

In case, however, a Church be built by individual liberality, it should be transferred as speedily as possible from individual control to that of a Vestry and congregation. When ready for Consecration and Public Worship, the donor should make a free-will offering of it for the Service of Almighty God, content himself to be numbered among the lowliest and least obtrusive of the worshippers therein. Where the property still remains in the hands of the individual, the congregation feel only as tenants at will, without power to make changes or improvements, and without desire to do so, because liable at any time to be dispossessed. The temporal and spiritual interests of a congregation can no more be dissevered than the rind of the orange in its growth can be from its pulp. They live and grow together. To place the control of the secularities in the hands of one man, and the care of only the spiritualities with the congregation at large, will, in the end, be death to both interests. It does a congregation good, spiritually, to have the right of property in the Church in which they worship, so that they can make various improvements, from time to time ;

it deepens interest, and opens their hearts the more to profit by the Means of Grace. Affection is always very much the fruit of care and labor for its object ; insomuch that a child, removed by death as soon as born, would not be loved like one around which parental anxiety has toiled and watched for years. Congregations are ready enough to accept the liberality of individuals, and would not object if it provided a Church for them, and removed from their care the whole expense of its Worship, but it would be bad policy for them in the end. God, if He grants such desires, sends leanness withal into their souls. And there is not infrequently, in such cases, the result that the death of the individual benefactor ensues, or pecuniary embarrassment comes upon him, while he still has control, or his plans are but imperfectly carried out, and then the Church property is entangled in the litigation that follows, or heirs that do not sympathize with the intentions of the giver, come in with their claims or their bitter complaints ; so that, in the end, the congregation is worse off, a hundred-fold, than if it had never had such help. Therefore, we say, let there be a complete transfer of all private claims in Church property, as soon as possible. It may seem hard to the man of wealth, but did he give for his own personal purposes, or for the good of the Church ? If for the former, he may still wish to wield and control it ; if for the latter, there is no hardship in the self-renunciation. The problem for the man of wealth to solve, is, how to draw out the resources of the congregation to the utmost amount and advantage for Church purposes ; how use his large means as an encouragement to, not a substitute for effort, and to take care that no change in his circumstances, not even his own death, shall make his pious gifts void, or a positive injury to the Parish.

When the wealth of one person is used in controlling the location of a new Church, so that, through his influence, an ineligible site is selected, accommodating him, indeed, but ill-chosen for the general interests and future prosperity of the Parish ; or when a building is erected through his instrumentality, entirely unsuited to the present wants, or probable future ability of the congregation ; a pernicious power is wield-

ed, for which the individual largess is a poor compensation. Many a Parish has been blighted for years, by such an influence. Far better is it to place the Church in the best location, and to make it in style what the sober judgment of the people approves, even at the sacrifice of every dollar of the offered gift. No rich man, with Christian principle, would ask any other decision, and if he refuses to act upon it, he of course exhibits selfish ends, and his wishes should be disregarded.

The title to the property of a Church, with the Rectorship lodged in the same hands, is a state of things to which many of the remarks already made will apply. Instances have occurred, where, in addition to other evil results, general charity has been appealed to for the repair, or completion of such Church property, and has been given on the supposition that it was for the cause of Christ; whereas, on the sale of the edifice, which has passed into the hands of some other religious body, or to some secular use, the proceeds of the sale, increased by the added value of these free-will offerings, have gone into the pocket of the seller, making his charitable collections, in fact, a case of money obtained under false pretences. Such a man may attempt to clear the matter to his own conscience, by pleading that he has lost in other ways, by the Church enterprise, more than he has gained by the contributions; still he will bear the suspicion of selfish and unworthy motives.

The building of a Church by an individual, virtually carries with it the choice of the Rector. Whatever may be said of such patronage in England, it is decidedly against our republican notions, and the general usages of our Church. That which the wisdom of the Church, by law or custom, has established as best, cannot and ought not to be annulled by the will of one man. The patron's choice of a Rector may be a wise one, but the people had better have it in their own hands, under advice from their Bishop, even though they sometimes make a foolish choice, than to set aside a sound general principle.

The title to the Church property being in the hands of one man, it usually, if not necessarily follows, that the Church is kept out of union with the Convention. Its parochial sta-

tistics may equal those of a small Diocese, yet its members can have no share in the legislation of their own Diocese. General usage here again has settled upon Conventions, and union with them is a duty. What one man may think of the expediency of Conventions with lay representation, or what may be the usage of some other national Church, is nothing to the purpose. Our general custom is our common law. It is every one's duty to submit to it, while he remains in the Church, and it is contumacy to set up an usage of his own. Every Bishop, if he expressed his opinion of such cases of isolation, would, probably, say that they were sometimes tolerated, but that it is wiser to have every Rector and Church in union with the Convention. If the practice were fully carried out, it would work an utter change in our Church organization and legislation. If that change be needed, it had better be brought about in some other way than by individual contumacy or secession.

Men of wealth, by demanding the erection of a Church edifice of great cost and magnificence, such as they would condescend to worship in, or such as would put their Parish on an equality with other religious bodies in the place, have sometimes greatly impeded Church growth, and exerted an influence for evil. In one large city, the establishment of the Church, where her Services had been unknown, was put back many years, simply because, though some \$10,000 or \$15,000 was offered, and a plain building could have been put up for that sum, \$20,000 or \$30,000 was deemed necessary for a genteel beginning. In other cases, the edifice has been commenced on a grand scale, to gratify such feelings, and the Rector has been sent forth to beg the funds for its completion, from those who are content to worship in an humbler Church, suited to their means and paid for by themselves.

The endowment of a Parish Church by individual munificence, is a kindred theme. Here again the rule holds good, that no provision shall be made that will relieve a people able and willing to support their own religious worship. Where a Church is in a poor neighborhood, not promising any future improvement in its resources, a small endowment may be desi-

nable, and has often proved, under God, the salvation of a Parish. A small fund for contingencies, may also be useful in any Parish. A Rectory, and glebe, pertaining not so much to the ordinary expenses of public Worship, as to the added comfort of the Rector, and the permanence of his settlement, may, therefore, well be provided for by private liberality. But large endowments operate unfavorably. They have sometimes perpetuated a Rector who was an incubus on the prosperity of the Parish; who, secure of its income, has fastened himself upon it, though the Church sadly suffered.

General charities, too, suffer in endowed parishes. It surely ought to be otherwise; and those who receive religious privileges freely, should give most freely to the cause of Christ elsewhere. Yet experience proves the contrary. Even the managers of the largest parish fund have not unfrequently regarded them as a doubtful blessing, while others pronounce them a positive curse to a parish. They draw upon it, for instance, ten thousand applications for aid, which the wealth of Cræsus could not supply; and the applicants, whether aided or refused, are generally unsatisfied, and disposed to complain. They dwarf charity within the parish, and hinder it outside. The Missionary seeking aid, is frequently refused on this very ground. He is told to go to that wealthy Church, which has such ample means to help him; and so, between the two, he gets absolutely nothing. What Christian would desire to bring about, by his large bequests, a state of things like this?

There is this also, usually, to blind the capitalist in such a case: the Parish is one that he has been connected with, and labored for all his life. His tenderest and warmest affections have clustered around it. To him it has been as a pet child, and with the means of largely enriching it, it is as natural that he should give to his own Church, as for a parent to give to his child. The very Rector himself, whom the Rubric makes his adviser in such a case, could hardly withstand the tempting thought of thousands for a Parish fund, if any intimation of such a thing were made to him, and would exhibit more than human strength were he to advise against it. The rich man, therefore, in casting about for a Christian disposi-

tion of his property, is in a peculiarly trying position. His Church pleads strongly, his fellow worshippers for a life-time will be gratified, his Pastor has not an opposing counsel to offer, and thus the Parish receives, ten-fold, what it needs, and dwindles, like a plant under too rich and too abundant fertilizers, so that that which was meant for its growth becomes its ruin. Or, as is sometimes the case with endowments, the property is wasted in law-suits, or alienated, and the Parish becomes poorer than if it had never had such an investment. Most happy would it be for the Christian man of wealth, aiming to do right, if he could have embodied, for his guidance in the munificence to which his heart prompted him, counsels founded on the Word of God, and sanctioned by wise experience.

Do we then discourage private munificence, or disparage it? Not at all. Every Christian heart leaps with joy, at every instance in which it is exhibited. Every tongue blesses God that there are men of wealth who know how to use it. Every one prays that the number may be increased a hundred fold. Our only aim and wish is, to suggest thoughts that will help to a truly wise exercise of that munificence, and save the Church from such exhibitions of it, as are injudicious and hurtful. There are ways enough, in this world of want, for it wisely to operate, and miseries enough for it to relieve. And the great principle for guidance seems to be, to meet those wants and miseries least likely to be relieved in the ordinary course of Christian charities and effort. Thus, in his benefactions to his own Parish, besides the things already mentioned, there is needed, the well-stocked Sunday School and Parish Library, with a fund for its annual replenishing; or a good Theological Library belonging to the Church for the use of the Rector, an investment which would come back to the people in streams of refreshing; or a Fund to keep up a Life Insurance for the Minister, for the time being. These are worthy and appropriate objects for private munificence. It is also exceedingly desirable to have, in our large parishes, Scholarships for the education of poor young men in the Parish, who may wish to enter the Sacred Ministry. Scholarships attached to

Colleges, and Seminaries, are needed ; but a Parish Scholarship has its advantages. It would hold out to a young lad a near view of aid, and encourage him in his aspirations, while, at the same time, the thorough knowledge that his own Rector would have of him, and the jealous watch of his fellow Christians acquainted with him from childhood, would be a security against the intrusion of unworthy candidates. Most grateful to the Rector would such a Parish Scholarship be—most appropriate that the wealth of one of its members should help one of its worthy sons. The endowment of a Parish School; or a Fund whose interest should be yearly distributed among the poor ; or a Parish Fund for the maintenance of a bed in a Hospital, or of an inmate of some “Home for the Aged ;” or an endowment for the support of a City Missionary, to labor in connection with the Rector and Mother Church,—these and other charities, according to the locality, and its present and prospective wants, all furnish desirable fields for the munificence of the man of wealth, and give him ample room to operate, without helping those who ought to help themselves.

There is no fear that such charities will be over-done. There is this great advantage in having endowments for religious purposes invested under the control of the Parish, rather than in General Institutions, that it brings the supervision of them within the personal inspection of the Rector, instead of placing it in the hands of a soulless corporation. A City Mission could, undoubtedly, be carried on by a Parish, if it had the means, better than by any general Society. Added to all is the consideration, that while large endowments invested in General Institutions, are often wasted by mismanagement, broken up by war, become a bone of contention in the division of Dioceses, and in various ways disappoint the pious intention of the donors, the Parish usually remains the same, with ability to apply the proceeds of an investment according to the exigencies and changes of the times, and as wisely as if the individual could himself live, from age to age, to distribute personally his own provisions for charity.

Yet there are the just claims of General Institutions. The

Church College, and the Seminary, are wanted for the student or the Parish Scholarship. Education, it is universally conceded, ought to be brought within the means of all, and assistance most grateful to the sensitive, is that which, without destroying self-respect, reduces the expenses of the College or Seminary, by general provisions, or increases the advantages which such Institutions can afford to their students. Large endowments for Professorships, Scholarships, Libraries, and general purposes, will thus bless, from age to age; they are essential to the very existence of Colleges and Seminaries, and, generally, the larger they are, the more likely they will be to secure their end. They have not, however, such fascination for the man of wealth, as the local and independent charity; for, to put in tens of thousands, and see them swallowed up, like the great stones underneath Solomon's Temple, in foundation work, is not like erecting a single pillar, such as Absalom's; but let the rich man remember what largely endowed Institutions have done, and are doing, and he will be content to add his offering to the mighty fabric. Church Colleges have a strong claim on private munificence, and a well endowed Theological Seminary in almost every Diocese, would not be amiss.

To specify all the various modes and ways in which the general principles that should govern private munificence may be carried out, would be a needless and hopeless task. Let the rule be with the wealthy Christian, as we have already said, to make his benefactions reach where there is most need, and the poorest prospect of supply, and where the most permanent good is to be done; where the gift will not relieve men of burdens which they are ordinarily able and willing to bear; where it will be a means of drawing out, not of checking the liberality of those of inferior wealth; and the ways in which all this can be done, will readily be found by one seeking, in the fear of God, to make such an investment.

How enviable is the lot, how high the privilege of the wealthy Christian, in being able to step forward, with his large offering, and at once accomplish some noble work for the Church, the desirableness of which all feel, but the attainment of which

seemed hopeless, until God stirred up his prospered servant to present his gift ! All honor to those who have the heart and the head to make a princely and a judicious offering for the Lord's service. The ability to amass great wealth, is the special talent of a few ; the will and judgment to use it as a faithful steward, is almost equally rare. If the Word of God makes the rich man's lot one of great perils, he who overcomes its dangers and temptations, and uses wealth aright, must stand high in God's favor and reward. Anxiously should those who have been prospered in business, and amassed fortunes, consider the question, what the Lord hath raised them to such an elevation for ; lest they make the miserable mistake of supposing, that all has been given for their own self-indulgence or aggrandizement, or to be transmitted to their children for their ruin in time and eternity ; or, lest they make ill-advised gifts and endowments, that will rather hinder than help the cause of Christ. Let them study and pray, that they may so dispose of their great resources as to advance the cause of Christ and the Church, and so that they themselves may look back from the world of blessedness, with praise to God for giving them riches, and the higher gift of Grace, rightly and wisely to use them.

ART. VIII.—THE FULTON STREET PRAYER MEETING
AND THE DAILY SERVICE.

Five years of Prayer, with the Answers. By SAMUEL IRENEUS PRIME, author of "Power of Prayer," &c., &c. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1864. pp. 375.

THE object we have in view, in placing this little volume at the head of this Article, is not a detailed criticism of either its matter or its manner. We do not propose to discuss the merits or demerits of the so-called Revival System, of which this is one of the out-croppings. It has been done again and again by wiser heads and abler pens: and the result has been, that while thorough-going Churchmen have been strengthened in their dislike of a System, so different from the calm, orderly procedure to which he has been accustomed, the Revivalist has in no wise been convinced:—nor can he be, so long as he attributes to the exclusive agency of the Divine Spirit, those unusual developments, which to other minds seem so largely the result of intense and unnatural excitements. With him seeing is believing. He enters a meeting when the Revival is at its height. If at all enthusiastic in his temperament, he is at once carried away in sympathy with what is there being transacted. He sees and hears a man, who has been for years a hardened profligate, come forward publicly and relate his experience, how he has been suddenly brought to see the error of his ways, how he has been "struck down" by the view of the enormity of his guilt, how he has as suddenly been brought into great light, and to the consciousness of being at peace with God, his sins pardoned, and himself restored to a new and better life; and all this related with an intensity of feeling no where else exhibited. The System in which he has been reared, has taught him to look for and expect just such sudden conversions as a rule, not as an exception. The preacher whose ministrations he has attended, has taught this as the ordinary method of God's dealing in the conversion of sinners. To him,

therefore, it is only a proof of the correctness of the views he has imbibed : and all bodily manifestations he may witness are only corroborations. Hence he reasons, that these operations, being from the agency of the Holy Spirit, a Church which has them not, and uses no machinery to bring them about, must be destitute of spirituality.

Now we have long thought, that it is absolutely of no use whatever to meddle with these opinionists. The better way is, to let them alone ; or, as the Saviour says, "go not after them," and only to wish them, for their uncharitable view of the Church System, repentance and better minds. If we could only disabuse their minds of their long-nurtured prejudice, they would see clearly enough, that the Church, in her *Christian Year*, has all the excellencies there are in the *Revival System*, without its defects and abuses. We believe, thoroughly, in the agency of the Holy Ghost in making bad men good, and good men better. We believe, thoroughly, in the efficacy of Prayer, both social and private, both personal and intercessory. But we do not believe that Prayer, to be fervent and effectual, must needs be extemporaneous, or that the telling of "experiences" is in good taste, or, particularly in the case of one who has been very bad, at all conducive to spiritual edification. Such a thing might, perhaps, be done in the confidence of personal and intimate friendship, but in public, and for the sake of bringing about or keeping up a "religious excitement," a truly Christian sentiment revolts against it.

However, this is apart from our purpose ; which is, to say a few earnest words to Churchmen, on a subject akin to that of which this little volume treats. We premise that the "*Christian world*" knows something about the "*Fulton Street Prayer Meeting*;" but, lest some of our readers may know but little of it, we will simply say, that some five or six years ago, in the City of New York, at the lecture room of the "*Dutch Reformed Church*," on Fulton street, there was commenced a series of Meetings for Prayer, day by day, designed especially for business men, assembling at twelve o'clock, at noon, and dismissing at one ; thus occupying an hour in the very busiest part of the day, in the busiest part of the City. These Meet-

ings were, from the first, well attended, and have been kept up daily, with almost unabated interest, we are told, to this time. Very shortly, owing to the great degree of interest manifested, other places followed the example, so that there was hardly a City or large Town throughout the country, which had not its noonday Meetings for Prayer. Most of these were continued only for a few months. But, in the Metropolis, in Boston, and in some few other places, we believe, they have been kept up until the present. It certainly was a singular phenomenon, that a Meeting at that particularly busy hour, in the very heart of the business community, should have been thronged by the class of men who did and do attend it. It certainly shows what apparent impossibilities may be accomplished by zeal and earnestness on the part of a very few earnest and good men. When the noonday Prayer Meeting had been in operation a year, the Rev. Dr. Prime, the author of our little book, published an account of it, in a work entitled, "*The Power of Prayer*," which was widely translated and republished, "and more than a hundred thousand copies distributed and read." "In many places in this and foreign countries, public Meetings were held, and chapters read from it, to quicken the desire and Faith of Christians, and to encourage them in prayer for the outpouring of the Holy Spirit." "In a large number of villages and rural congregations, Revivals of Religion followed the reading of these remarkable facts," &c.

The volume before us is a sequel to that, and contains a report of a large number of "facts which are well authenticated; and having been tested by time, the genuineness of the results is established." The object of its publication is, we again quote from the Introductory Chapter, "for the sake of a more distinct and specific effect, the power of Prayer is, in this little volume, exhibited in the various departments of public, social, and domestic life, showing the remarkable answers which God has given to praying parents, husbands, wives and children, to Christians in the Army and the Navy—a wondrous display of sovereign Grace and power; and as we follow the narrative across the sea into Europe, Africa, Asia, and the Isles of the ocean, we shall see that the same Spirit worketh all in all over

the whole earth, and in answer to the humblest believer's prayers." In accordance with this design, the author gives us, through some twenty chapters, a series of "remarkable conversions of children, Infidels, Roman Catholics, Soldiers and Seamen, at home and abroad, very many of which are traceable to the "Fulton Street Meeting," where united Prayers for these distinct and special objects were offered. Without detailing any of the examples adduced, we are willing to admit that these results did follow as answers to prayer; and in so doing, we are not at all to be understood as approving of the "Revival System," any more than we should allow that apparent success is always a proof of merit. We simply admit the fact, patent on every page of Holy Writ, that God does hear and answer prayer; and were we called on for proofs of this fact, we would rather select them from Holy Scripture, and from other sources, than from this little volume. Our present object, as we have said, is not to examine the "Revival System." If we were to test it by its fruits, we would not need to give the results of our own observation, which has not been a limited one; we would quote the language of men who have been the ablest and most efficient friends and exponents of that System. Their testimony is, that its cauterizing and exhaustive process has covered whole regions of country, where it has been thoroughly tried, with spiritual barrenness and moral death; that it has unsettled a regular Ministry, has disgusted and alienated from Christianity, thoughtful and sensible men; and that its fruits, even in the converts themselves, in untold numbers of instances, have been in their relapse into utter hardness of heart and blindness of mind.

Why, then, notice this volume at all? Simply for this reason: that it shows conclusively,—1st, the acknowledged want, among earnest men, of Daily united Prayer, and,—2dly, the entire feasibility of a Daily Public Service. That Daily Prayer is the duty of every Christian, there can be no doubt at all. That Prayer in Families is a duty, is also allowed generally, and it is a duty which ought to be performed far more generally than it is. But that Daily Public Prayer is a duty, or a privilege, or even expedient, is a matter wherein

Christian men have allowed themselves to doubt very much. But we do not think it a hard thing to prove, by any means. If there be a richer, larger promise to Public Prayer than to private, as there undoubtedly is ; if the example of the Saviour and His Apostles and Disciples, who went daily to the Temple, has any weight ; if the Early Church, in spite of persecution, kept up a Daily Service ; if the prescription of our own Church, which places in the very fore-front of her Service-Book, that it is the order for Daily Morning Prayer, has authority with Churchmen,—then how can we doubt of the daily duty ? In the book before us, we see an account of wonderfully large results following from a Daily Public Service among those whose system, we as Churchmen must regard as being, to say the least, far less perfect than our own ; and we are constrained to think, that vastly larger and better results would flow from the same amount of zeal and earnestness, directed through the channels which the Church has provided ; and we only make use of this comparison to stimulate Churchmen to a better appreciation of their privileges, and to a fuller performance of their duty.

We have long felt that there is great remissness among Churchmen, in regard to the use of those Means of Grace which are, or ought to be, Public and Daily. Even in our Cities, where the Houses of God are of easy access, we find but a small proportion of them open every day ; and in those that are open, we find almost invariably a very small number of worshippers ; and this fact shows, either a deplorable want of Faith in our own System ; or else, as lamentable a need of religious earnestness in our people ; or else, an amount of ignorance as to the benefits of Public Prayers, which is truly alarming.

Each of these three causes exists, and has a prevailing influence ; and their combination will account for a large proportion of that torpor and deadness which hinder the growth in numbers and in Grace of this Branch of Christ's Church. Who can doubt that there is this very deplorable want of Faith in our own System, when we perceive, ever and anon, some person with zeal outrunning his discretion, dissatisfied

with what he calls the "tame monotony" of our Liturgy, and attempting to graft upon it the wild turbulences and excitements of the "Revival System?" When we hear some objecting to a Daily Service, unless a "word of exhortation" be added, as an offset to "cold Prayers;" when we know of those among our chief Clergy, who,—whether to confess the inferiority of our own Church in Gracious means and appliances, or, as we have heard it expressed, to get "warmed up with Revival excitement," it would not become us to say,—have instituted week-day Prayer Meetings, in which the full Service was carefully put aside, to make room for the exhortations and extempore prayers of both Clergy and Laity.

We have usually a great deal to say about the excellence of our noble Liturgy. Its Spirituality, its Adaptation to all man's varying wants and circumstances, its Conformity to Holy Scripture, its Superiority to other methods, and to Extempore Prayers, form the prominent subjects of many of our Lectures and Sermons. It is right that it should be so. But after all that is said, the question naturally arises, why then do you not use your "noble Liturgy" more frequently than you do in all its fullness? Why do some of your Ministers seek every opportunity of getting rid of that Liturgy, and of showing their "gift" in extempore effusions? Is not that a proof that there are wants and circumstances, in the ever-changing affairs of life, to which your Liturgy and your System are alike unsuited? We answer no, by no means. It only shows that there are men among us who lack sympathy with the System of the Church, who crave novelty and excitement, and who have so illy learned and digested the requirements of their own Church, as thus grossly to misrepresent her.

It does not admit of doubt, that our Church contemplates a Daily Service as the general rule; and the Church of England makes the express injunction, that her prescribed Form of Prayer shall be said Daily by all her Clergy; if it cannot be in Public, then in private. The title to the Morning Prayer is "the Order for Daily Morning Prayer." "The Psalter shall be read through once every Month." "To know what Lessons shall be read every day, look for the day of the month in

the Calendar following, and there ye shall find the Chapters that shall be read for the Lessons, both at Morning and at Evening Prayer." We are taught to pray that "God who has safely brought us to the beginning of this day, may defend us in the same, by His Mighty Power, that this day we fall into no sin," &c. All this has no distinct and peculiar reference to the Lord's Day Service, but is common to every day alike. Daily Public Service is the rule, the omission is the exception. But it has come to pass, that the omission is the rule, and the performance the exception. That Service will only be restored, as Faith in our own Church is restored, and as the confidence returns, that in her provisions may be found all things necessary for our spiritual well-being. We do not trust ourselves to our System, as the Divinely appointed Means of Grace. Our unbelief begins with the very initial Sacrament. We do not believe, at least many of us do not act upon the belief, that we are therein made "children of God," as we are taught, but that only after years of sin, we are converted, and so become children of God. We do not believe, or act upon the belief, that our Catechism is a sufficient compend of Christian Doctrine for our children's instruction; we either throw it aside entirely, or cover it up with a huge pile of "Union" and other Questions, about matters, very many of which not only ignore, but are in direct opposition to the System which the Church teaches. Very many have come to regard the Holy Communion as only a solemn ceremony, a commemorative Rite. And so it is with our Prayers. There is a perpetual hankering after something new, something varied, something which shall give life to the Service, when all that can give true life to the Service, is God's Holy Spirit in the heart of the worshipper. The trouble is all in ourselves. If the Prayers lack interest, if they seem cold and monotonous, the fault is in our own hearts, and the remedy is to be there applied. When this fact is seen and appreciated, and not before, we shall look for a general "Revival" of the Daily Service.

The neglect of Daily Public Service shows a lamentable need of earnestness and zeal in our people. Christian zeal

should have for its end the advancement of God's honor and glory, the increase of His Kingdom among men, and the promotion of our own salvation and temporal welfare. But we make this last the chief end ; and having, as we hope, provided for our own things, we listlessly leave the other higher objects to take care of themselves. Now this is the veriest selfishness imaginable,—a sinful selfishness, which rests like an incubus upon the Church ; and which over-reaches itself, too, as all selfishness will. For how are we taught by our Saviour, that Heaven's blessings are best obtained ? “ Seek first the Kingdom of God and His Righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you.” All what things ? Why, all things necessary for our temporal well-being. That is what the Saviour means. After the things of God are provided for, He will provide what is necessary for us. We reverse the order. We provide for “ all these things ” first, and then what little is left, of time, or money, or thought, or influence, we dole out unwillingly to God. This is a great fault of our times, infecting all ; not Church people more than others, but shown to be the case with Church people, because they neglect that which is especially of use in extending the Kingdom of God, and showing forth His Glory among men.

We can conceive of nothing which conduces more to the Glory of God, than the public acknowledgment of our entire dependence on Him ; and if men see, by our daily observance of Public Worship, that we are in earnest about it, they, too, will come to glorify our Father in Heaven. This is one of the chief things in which we can make our light shine before men. The Church and the World are so necessarily commingled in the affairs of daily life, that it is sometimes difficult to distinguish one from the other. There are very many men whose entire thoughts are wrapped up in their plans for this world. They are good husbands, good fathers, fair in all business transactions, punctual to their engagements ; they do not swear, because it is ungentlemanly ; they do not lie, because “ honesty is the best policy.” In nothing, as far as these points are concerned, could the most zealous Christian conduct himself more discreetly. Still a distinction should be observ-

able. But wherein? Not in these points, but in that reverence for Almighty God, which is best shown by His Public Adoration and Worship. There must be some distinctive mark of a Christian, or how can he let his light shine? It must be something that can be seen of men. It cannot be his private prayer and intercourse with his Maker, however intimately that may affect his character and conduct. It cannot be his devotions in his Family, for that is only a partial publicity. It cannot be his integrity in business, for others are equally honest. It ought not to be his continually talking about his Religion, for that would, perhaps, very properly be esteemed as cant. Some would place this difference in such things as dress or manner; but such things as these do not show a man's religion. How, then, can it better be shown than by his recognition of God, by his daily attendance on Public Divine Service? True, hypocrites may do the same. But the abuse of a good thing does not prove it to be a bad one. The very fact of a person's hypocritically pretending to be a religious man, by frequenting Divine Service daily, would be proof of the general opinion that those Services are among the chief means whereby man's religion ought to be known.

The Christian man may say that he will give generously of his substance for building Churches, for the support of the poor, for the spread of the Gospel. So he will, and so far forth, that does prove a great deal. A man that is niggardly in his charities, does not deserve the name of a Christian. He that honors not God with his substance, breaks the Divine Law, and forgets his stewardship. But God wants, and rigidly demands, far more than that. He wants the heart. He wants the man himself, body, soul, and spirit, as a Worshipper. We know there are many men who willingly give their money, but who yet feel that to give half an hour, Morning and Evening, would be too great a sacrifice. The excuse is often made that to devote so much time would infringe on their business, and so on their charities. But this is palpably a vain excuse. The truth is, the man wants the time all for himself. Like Cain, he will bring only such an offering as pleases himself; while God has respect to that burnt sacrifice, which hon-

ors Him most. It is not merely by giving money, that God is most honored. It is by the devotion of the heart ; and that inward devotion is to have an outward expression, which may be seen and felt by the world. Surely in no way can this be done more acceptably than by the habitual acknowledgment of God in the Daily Service.

It may be said, after all, a man's well-ordered daily life is the best proof of his piety. Let it be so. Is the life well-ordered, when the due recognition of the Almighty is left out of the account ? Or can the life be well-ordered, without Prayer ? and of all Prayer, is not Public Prayer the most efficacious ? Is the promise of Christ's Special Presence in the Public Assembly to go for nothing ? Or is it of so little benefit, that it may be safely confined to two or three occasions on one day of the week ? We humbly think not. The neglect of Prayer, and especially of that most effectual kind of Prayer which we are now advocating, proves a fearful want of hearty desire that the life should be well-ordered ; proves a want of zeal and earnestness in working out the individual salvation, no less than in declaring the Glory of God and setting forward His Kingdom.

There is a third reason why the provision of our Church for a Daily Service is not carried out. It is the ignorance of thousands among us of the benefits derived from Public Prayer. The general duty and benefit of Prayer is, on all hands, admitted. But the prevalent opinion is something like this ; "I can say my prayers as well at home, and so devote the time to my business which the frequenting of the Public Service would consume." Now the question is, is it true that prayers may as well be said at home ? Some prayers doubtless can. The express rule is laid down by Our Lord, "When thou hast entered into thy closet and shut thy door, pray to thy Father in secret." Every person has his own spiritual and temporal wants, which are to be laid before God in secret. That is a duty of which we would not abate one jot or tittle. But, in addition to this, there are certain distinct promises of special blessings dependent on Public Prayer.

Take the Lord's Day Services. Why are they prescribed ?

Not because a Sermon is usually delivered, which seems to have become the principal reason for modern Church-going, but that God may be honored, by the public and general recognition of His Majesty, and for the benefits which spring from united Worship. A Sermon is a good thing, an important thing, and very appropriate to the occasion, when so many are convened ; but whether there be a Sermon or not, the great object is Worship. God's House is the House of Prayer, not the House of Preaching, exclusively or chiefly ; and this is a fact which we, at the present time, would do well to bear in mind. Had there been less Preaching and more Prayer, we should be far better off as a people than we are. Worship, then, is the purpose of our Public Assembling on the Lord's Day. Doubtless one reason for the institution of the "Christian Sabbath" was to secure freedom from earthly cares and avocations, in which the whole body of the Church might worship, with one accord. Doubtless there are many who could not attend a Daily Service, and we do not advocate it as the bounden duty of all. There may be rural parishes, and large parishes, too, where a Daily Service is well nigh impracticable. Obviously, a man whose routine of daily labor begins with the dawn of day, and only ends with the light, cannot be at prayers at nine A. M., and four P. M. ; and yet, probably he might, if the opportunity were offered, spend a few moments in this manner on his way to his work and on his return ; and when a parish, especially in the city, consists largely of laboring men, who have no other place of retirement, the opportunity ought to be given, even at the unfashionable hours of daylight and dark. We believe it would help, not hinder. Still, a very large number of our Parishes are not made up of this class. The Church in our large cities comprises the rich, the refined, the fashionable, to a large extent. For these, the Lord's-Day Services are not the only convenient seasons for Public Prayer, and there is no reason, in the nature of things, why the Lord's-Day Services should be, with them, the only Public Services. There are thousands on thousands of men and women, in our larger cities and towns, who have ample leisure to attend a Daily Service, and we have no hesitation in saying that there is a

great dereliction in duty, both on the part of Clergy who refuse to open their Churches and of Laity who refuse to attend. In this day of intense and wide-sweeping worldliness and ungodliness, this day of National calamity and mourning, when Balls and Routs and Operas and Theatres are crowded, at an expenditure of time and health and money, unparalleled in the history of the country, and we might almost say of the world, a Daily Public Service is positively demanded. Let it be seen and known, who is on the Lord's side. All honor to the Priest of the Most High who shall dare put that question, with an emphasis which shall have a meaning, in the ears of Fashionable Christianity. We know there are Christians of high culture and elevated social position, who are sick, even to loathing, of the miserable sham of modern fashion, and who positively long for more frequent communion with God in His Holy Temple. They would try the experiment of the Romish System, for this very reason, if they had more confidence in it, and less confidence in the foundations of their own.

Let us glance at some of the benefits of such a Service. In the first place, there is the Honor shown to Almighty God by a large concourse of people assembled in His Name, with the avowed purpose of doing Him Service. We, as a people, are greatly lacking in reverence, and the example of a large attendance on His Daily Worship, would go very far toward obviating this acknowledged general defect. The circumstances of Public Worship lend a solemnity to the supplications so offered, which can hardly fail, if allowed its appropriate influence, of its effect in obtaining a gracious answer. The sanctity of the place, set apart from unhallowed and profane uses, to be "none other than the House of God, the very Gate of Heaven;" the hushed stillness which pervades the Sanctuary of the Most High; the presence of His ambassador, clothed in his official garb; the humble posture; and, especially, the feeling, that this is the very spot where Christ Himself is accustomed to meet those coming together in His Name,—all these things ought to impress us with a greater degree of awe and solemnity than we have elsewhere, and therefore to render our prayers more fervent and effectual. There is also great

power derived from agreement and sympathy in Worship, a power which is felt in all public assemblies, for whatever purpose, but particularly valuable here, inasmuch as the Lord Himself has made that very agreement a matter of especial promise, "If two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father Which is in Heaven." If the agreement of two can effect so much, in procuring the answer to Prayer, how much more availing would be the consentient mind and voice of a whole congregation?

More reasons for a Daily Service might be added; such as the enjoined custom of the elder Dispensation, especially as approved by the Example of our Lord's attendance; the practice of the Apostles and Early Church, who assembled daily, in spite of danger, and in the face of persecution; as also the express injunction, "not to forsake the assembling of ourselves together." These are reasons enough for any honest-minded man. We might also urge particularly the present necessity of Daily Public Prayer, in this time of great public calamity; but that will commend itself to every thoughtful mind.

The objections to Daily Service will be found, on examination, to be of very little weight. There will hardly be any at all to the theory. The difficulty is in the practice. The Clergy may say, we cannot get a congregation together on week days. This we do not believe. We would not expect to see so large a congregation as gathers on Sundays; many persons will be detained by necessary business and household cares; but few of our larger parishes would fail to assemble far more than enough to claim the promise to "two or three." Let such hours be chosen as are most convenient for the majority of worshippers; let the Church be properly warmed and ventilated, to prevent the scruples of those who fear "taking cold;" let it be proclaimed from the pulpit, that God's Daily Worship is a solemn duty and a high and holy privilege; let the benefits which may be expected be fairly set forth, and we do not believe, in any case, that the Minister would be left to

worship alone. There are some Churches open every day for Service, and there is always a congregation, not large it is true, not so large as it ought to be, but large enough to be benefitted, and very substantially benefitted too, for we know of many who have come to regard the Daily Service as one of their choicest daily blessings, and have felt, when deprived of it, by illness or unavoidable detention, as David of old, "My soul hath a desire and longing to enter into the Courts of the Lord." Let the Clergy get rid of the idea that Preaching is the great object of Public Assemblies, and that unless their Pulpit Ministrations are listened to by a full and delighted audience, the Service is of little or no consequence, and the way will be open for a far higher view of Clerical duty in this regard. Let them first appreciate the benefits of Public Prayer themselves, let them have faith in Christ and in the power of Prayer, and they will not regard the time or strength spent in Daily Service, as thrown away or wasted on a few. The "Fulton Street Prayer Meeting" shows that Laymen can be got out to Daily Prayers, and got out, too, at seemingly the most inconvenient hour of the day, if the proper effort only is made, and if the heart is engaged; and here is the great difficulty to be overcome. We wish the effort might be made by every one of our City Clergy, and we do not for a moment doubt that God's blessing would crown the effort with abundant success, as it has already done in many cases with which we are conversant.

The common objection on the part of the Laity is, "we have not the time." This, too, is apparent and not real. It is, we fear, an objection made to cover the want of disposition. We know enough of the habits of business men in general, to be led to believe, that with very little sacrifice to themselves, they might attend Morning and Evening Service every day, and devote a half hour on their way to their business, and on their return, to God's Worship, if they have a mind. We have known of such Laymen, who were yet charged with cares and responsibilities of the weightiest kind. There may be individual cases where such attendance would be simply im-

possible ; but, in general, we think that we know it to be entirely feasible. We do not ask an hour in the middle of the day, when business presses most urgently,—though the “Fulton Street Prayer Meeting” shows that that is not an impossibility, even for the busiest of busy men, when the heart is set upon its object ;—but we do ask our zealous and earnest Laymen to honor God, and to give the Church, the Nation, and themselves the benefit of their Daily Public Prayers, by repairing to their Parish Church ; or, if that be not open, or is not accessible, then to any other that is near at hand, at such hours as will least interfere with their avocations.

ART. IX—ANTE-REVOLUTIONARY CHURCH AND CLERGY.

It is evidently not well understood, how large a number of Church of England Clergymen—now called Protestant Episcopal—there were in the Colonies before, and at the commencement of the Revolution, in proportion to the then population. Nor is it known, it may be well doubted, how much under God had been then accomplished by that Ministry, nor how much the Church still owes to it.

To do something towards correcting these erroneous impressions, to which reference is here made, the following statements are submitted. In New Hampshire, there was 1 Clergyman, perhaps more. In Massachusetts, 15. In Rhode Island, 4. In Connecticut, at least 17. New York, 20. New Jersey, 11. Pennsylvania, 10. Delaware, 5. Maryland, 50. Virginia, at least 100. North Carolina, 18. South Carolina, 20. Georgia, 3. Florida, 4. These numbers may be regarded as very nearly accurate, giving us 278.

The population at that time is estimated to have been 2,800,000. This would be one Episcopal Clergyman to every 10,000, not regarding the fraction. And how does this compare with things now, much as the Church has gained within the last few years? The Census of 1850, not completed before 1852, gives us a population of 23,200,000. And the Almanac of that time gives us 1,632 Clergymen; in other words, one Episcopal Clergyman to every 14,340 only! And it is not presumed that the proportion varies materially now from what it was then. This certainly gives us something to think of.

We may thus perceive, what perhaps we may not be much pleased to perceive, that the Church, at the commencement of the Revolution, was stronger in its comparative numbers than it is now. Up to that time, the work done was mostly pioneer work; and the Church may now justly be said to have entered into the labors of that generation.

And one thing still further. The character and standing of the Ante-Revolutionary Clergy of the Church, is clearly under-rated. From among them have come Bishop INGLIS of Nova Scotia ; and Bishops SEABURY, WHITE, PROVOOST, MADISON, CLAGGETT, ROBERT SMITH, BASS, JARVIS, BENJAMIN MOORE, and PARKER. Besides, Pettigrew, Leaming, Peters, Griffith, and Wm. Smith, were elected to the Episcopate, though not consecrated. BOUCHER was offered the Episcopate of Edinburgh, Scotland, but declined, and CHANDLER that of Nova Scotia. Not that these were by any means alone in their class.

There were unquestionably some bad men among the Clergy of that day, but their number was comparatively few. We hear, indeed, much of them, and seem to hear as if there were no others. And yet, in one parish in Maryland, with which the writer is acquainted, out of its twenty-two Ante-Revolutionary Rectors, only one was a bad man. In another, having five successive Rectors before 1776, one only of these was bad ; and yet almost all that is remembered of these Rectors in these parishes, is connected with the two exceptionable ones. And these parishes are no exceptions to the general fact.

But it is time the so widely prevalent ideas of the Ante-Revolutionary Clergy of the Church, should be done away. And, as contributing something to this end, the following names have been selected, almost at random ; none of which are commemorated in the list of those who appear in DR. SPRAGUE'S "ANNALS OF THE AMERICAN PULPIT," to show what men the Church had in her ranks in her early days,—days of Colonial vassalage.

1697,—REV. WILLIAM VESEY, New York City.

1702,—REV. JOHN TALBOT, Burlington, N. J.

1707,—REV. JAMES ADAMS, North Carolina.

1707,—REV. EDWARD VAUGHAN, Elizabethtown, N. J.

1721,—REV. WILLIAM BECKET, Sussex Co., Del.

1744,—REV. CLEMENT HALL, Edenton, N. C.

1745,—REV. THOMAS THOMPSON, Monmouth Co., N. J.

1746,—REV. PHILIP READING, New Castle Co, Del.

I.—WILLIAM VESEY.

It is certainly due to the first Rector of Trinity Church, New York City, and such Mr. Vesey was, that his name should be perpetuated. His birth place has not been ascertained by us, but he was a graduate of Harvard in 1693. He was a gentleman well known in New York; and after the Church was built, the Vestry offered him the Rectorship, provided he would receive Holy Orders. Accordingly, he repaired to England and was ordained. On his return, he performed Divine Service in the new Church, for the first time, Feb. 6, 1697. It was during his Rectorship, in 1705, that the grant was made to the Church by deed patent of a tract of land called "the Queen's Farm," lying on North River, north from St. Paul's Chapel, to what is now Christopher Street—then indeed of no great value, and unproductive, but has since become a source of immense revenue and of litigation. The Church so increased under his ministry, that in 1708, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel appointed and sent him an assistant, who devoted himself mainly to the slaves and Indians, of whom it is stated that there were 1500 in the city. The children of these latter, Mr. V. was accustomed to catechise—and they numbered 200—every Sunday afternoon in the Church. Such had now become his prominence in the Church, that in 1710, he was appointed by the Bishop of London his Commissary. The first Trinity Church was a small square edifice; but in 1737 it was enlarged to 148 feet in length, including the chancel and tower, and 72 feet in breadth, with a steeple 175 feet high. The necessity for this enlargement spoke well for Mr. Vesey's ministry. A School was then connected with the Church, which exists to the present time. Considering what was done for poor children, and servants, both Indian and Negroes, great numbers of whom were instructed and baptized, it may be justly said, that under Mr. Vesey's ministry the Gospel was emphatically preached to the poor. His long Ministry of nearly fifty years was finished July 11, 1746, on which day he died. He had conscientiously performed the duties of his office, with unwearied diligence and uncommon abilities, to the general satisfaction and applause of all.

II.—JOHN TALBOT.

Mr. Talbot had been Rector of Freethorn, in the diocese of Gloucester, England, in which country he was born. In April, 1702, he was the Chaplain of the ship in which the REV. GEORGE KEITH, in that year, came over to America. But he was so taken with Mr. K.'s Mission, that he at once determined to join him in it; and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, approving of the measure, accordingly appointed him, September 18, 1702. Having finished his travelling service with Mr. Keith, in 1705 he settled in Burlington, New Jersey; and the next year the Society appointed him their Missionary to reside in that place. It was then the Capital of West Jersey, and contained about a thousand inhabitants. He did not confine his labors, however, to that town. In Oct., 1704, he writes, "I have gone several times from Burlington to Amboy, to Hopewell, to Elizabethtown and to Staten Island." In the beginning of 1706, he went over to England, with an Address from the Missionaries of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, to the Queen, for a Suffragan Bishop for the Colonies, and to procure books and Missionaries. On his return, he writes, in 1708, February, that he was forced to itinerate, having the care of all the Churches of the Church of England, in New Jersey, upon him; and six years after that, there never was a Minister of the Church of England, besides himself, in West Jersey. Previous to this, however, he had built three Churches, those of Burlington, Bristol, and Hopewell. In 1720, he returned to England again. And while there, he was consecrated to the Episcopate, by some of the Non-juring Bishops, who had been deprived of their jurisdiction in the English Church, on the accession of William and Mary to the Throne. He returned in 1725; but the fact of his consecration coming to the knowledge of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, he was in that same year dismissed from their employ. He died in less than two years after this, in 1727. He was an honest, fearless, and laborious Missionary. He had purchased a house and two or three lots of ground, adjoining the Church in Burlington; and after his last return from England, he gave them to St. Mary's Church,

there, for a Parsonage and Glebe ; showing his undiminished attachment to the Parish which he had raised up, and to which he had ministered for more than twenty years.

III.—JAMES ADAMS.

We first meet with Mr. Adams in 1707, as a Missionary from the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, in North Carolina ; having the North East and North West Parishes, Pasquotank, and also the Currituck precinct adjoining. In the exercise of his ministry here, he met with personal abuses and contumelies, and the most sacred parts of religion were impiously ridiculed and profaned. His stipend from the Society was only £50 or £60, and his support from his people was miserably insufficient, not so much as to pay for his diet and lodging ; while his duties were very heavy, the places at which he preached being 60 and 70 miles distant from each other. But "I pray God," he writes, "to give me His grace, so to direct my ways in this troublesome and unsettled country, that I may be able to give a comfortable account of my stewardship, at that dreadful tribunal where the secrets of all hearts shall be disclosed. I have undergone a world of trouble and misery, both in body and mind. I have struggled these two years with a barbarous and lawless people, and endure more, I believe, than any of the Society's Missionaries have ever done before me." He had a population among whom he ministered, of near 2,000. In the two years of which he speaks, he baptized 213 children and 2 adults, and preached constantly. Worn out with labors and sufferings in that fatal climate, after a ministry of three years, he resigned in the Summer or Fall of 1710, to return to England ; but it was not so permitted him. He was seized with a fatal illness, and died in North Carolina.

The Vestry of Pasquotank thus testified of him :—"As for the difficulties he met with, he waded through them all, under the vigilant eyes of the malicious enemy, without committing any thing unbecoming a minister of Christ." And Col. Glover, President of the Council, wrote, "we, with sorrowful hearts and true love and affection, take our leave of him. We

should be very unjust to his character, if we did not give him the testimony of a painful and pious Pastor, whose sweetness of temper, diligence in his calling, and soundness of doctrine, hath so much conduced to promote the great end of his mission."

IV.—EDWARD VAUGHAN.

Of Mr. Vaughan, we learn nothing till his arrival in Elizabethtown, N. J., in the Fall of 1707. He was sent to that place by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and his Report in 1709 shows something of his industry and success. In two years he had baptized 80 children and 12 adults. He had officiated once a month at Rahway, and once a fortnight at Woodbridge, where a Chapel had been built, and had distributed the Bibles and Prayer Books which the Society had sent him. He had officiated also at Piscataway, where were about 400 inhabitants. His earnestness had produced the happiest effects, especially on the young people.

After he had ministered in his field ten years, we have this testimonial of him from his admiring people to the Society: "Mr. Vaughan hath prosecuted the duties of his holy calling with the utmost application and diligence, adorned his character with an exemplary life and conversation, and so behaved himself with all prudence and fidelity, showing incorruptness, gravity, sincerity, and sound speech, that they who are of the contrary part have no evil thing to say of him." Fourteen years pass away, and in 1731 he says, in his Report, that in two years he had baptized 556 children and 64 adults. Eight years after this we learn that he had 84 communicants. And when the end of his ministry drew near, it is gratifying to see the interest which he took in his Church by providing for it after he was gone. He died in 1748, leaving for the use of the Church of England Minister at Elizabethtown, and his successors, forever, his house and nine acres of land. His Ministry thus was continued there for more than forty years; and when finished he left behind him a grateful and loving people, in whose memory he was held dear.

V.—WILLIAM BECKETT.

In 1721, Mr. Beckett was sent by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, to Lewes, Sussex County, Delaware. He represents it as 140 miles South from Philadelphia, and as a large and handsome town. His ministry, however, was not confined to the town, but extended over the whole County, embracing a tract of country fifty miles by twenty. The diligence with which he labored, was followed by signal success. He officiated at Lewes ; at a place eight miles distant ; and at another twenty-five miles. In his first six months, he baptized fifty-five, of whom nine were adults. And so considerable was the change in the community, that the magistrates and gentlemen of the County presented to him their thanks for the reformation of the blasphemers and drunkards, which his ministry had been instrumental in effecting. He preached in such houses as were most convenient, and in doing which he travelled sixty or seventy miles every week. In 1724, he writes the Society, we have now three churches in this county, and yet none of them will contain the hearers that constantly attend. People make no account, he writes, of riding twenty miles to Church, Sunday after Sunday. In 1729, a fourth Church had been built, in the middle of the County. Thirteen years after this, in 1742, and when his ministry was now drawing to a close, he writes that his four Churches on Sundays and holidays were filled. In the Summer, indeed, they could not hold the congregations which gathered ; and he was "often obliged to preach under the green trees, for room, for shade, and for fresh air." He had never less than eighty baptisms in a year ; but there was no other Clergyman within sixty miles of him. The history of the latter part of his ministry shows, that it was no mere transient effect which his early ministry produced.

He died, after a ministry of twenty-two years, in Sussex County, in 1743 ; leaving behind him the character of a faithful, orthodox, and successful Pastor.

VI.—CLEMENT HALL.

Mr. Hall had, for some years, been a respectable inhabitant of North Carolina, and held the Office of a Magistrate. He had

also officiated as lay reader in congregations having no ordained Minister. And moved with the great destitution of the province, he repaired to England, carrying with him testimonials from the Attorney General, Sheriffs, and others, and was ordained by the Bishop of London, November 29, 1744, and returned as a Missionary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, with an allowance of £30 per annum. His Ministry was chiefly confined to Chowan County, though not exclusively. His residence was at Edenton, but his Mission was itinerant. There was at this time no other Church of England Clergyman in the Province but Mr. Moir. He officiated regularly two Sundays in the Court House, and the third in distant parts of his Parish, in which were 1,200 tythables.

In one of his earliest Reports, he writes, that in a visit throughout his Mission of three weeks, he preached 16 times, baptized 400 children and 20 adults. His congregations were numerous, and well behaved. And in three visits south of the River Chowan, he baptized 780 children and 36 adults. In another, of October 8, 1747, in a ride of 350 miles in 4 weeks, he preached 12 times, baptized 365 children and 11 adults, besides administering the Communion. So in 1750, in a journey of three weeks, he officiated 16 times, baptized 217 white children, and 17 colored ones. The Chapels and Court Houses were seldom large enough to contain half the numbers who came to hear him. Sometimes they met in the shades of the forest; at others by the river side, or upon the sea shore; and his work had free course, and the Word was magnified.

In eight years, he writes that he had travelled 14,000 miles, officiated continually to numerous congregations, visited the sick, properly instructed 6,195 persons, and administered the Communion, on a single journey, to 300, and, in nine years, that he had baptized 7,522 persons.

In 1755, owing to sickness and increasing age, he confined his labors to St. Paul's Parish, in which Edenton was, with the Society's permission. Soon after this, his house took fire, and together with his books, sermons, clothing, and most part of his property, was destroyed. The Society early thereafter, as a token of their good will, granted him £30 and a new

library. But though he had proposed to confine himself to his parish, he nevertheless took frequent missionary journeys. In the first half of 1757, he had travelled two hundred miles, preached, read Prayers, administered the Lord's Supper to many very worthy communicants, and baptized 180. In 1758, he officiated in the three congregations of Berkley, and St. John's Parishes, besides his own. Many more instances of his journeys were equally successful. In one, for instance, he baptized 97 in one day; preached 19 times; baptized in all 486; and administered the Communion, after examination, to 248. This was during a journey of 427 miles in 30 days. These are but specimens of his ministry, but they show us the man.

At length, worn out with sickness and hard toil, having from his own means mainly supported himself in the prosecution of his work, for his missionary stipend never exceeded £30, CLEMENT HALL, after fifteen years of ministerial labor, rarely if ever equalled, closed his life in the midst of a grateful and devoted people.

VII.—THOMAS THOMPSON

Mr. Thompson was a fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge, England. He was licensed for New Jersey, by the Bishop of London, May 25, 1745, and sent by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, to Shrewsbury, in Monmouth County. He was not only a learned man, but a laborious and successful Minister. In May, 1748, he writes the Society in his Annual Report, that during the year, he had baptized 61 children, 16 white adults, and 3 colored ones; and that 50 new communicants had been added; that his congregation was numerous, and had almost finished a very neat new Church.

But this was not sufficiently a missionary field for his ardent spirit. In 1750, therefore, he proposed to the Society to be transferred to Africa; and in their Report for 1751, the Society say, "the Rev. Mr. Thompson, who resigned his fellowship in Cambridge, out of pure zeal to become a missionary in the cause of Christ, and hath done great service to it in New Jersey for more than five years past, hath resolved to go and serve Him in Africa in Guinea." He accordingly went to that

benighted region, for the conversion of the negroes there ; giving as a reason, " that if ever the Church of Christ is to be founded among the negroes, somebody must lay the first stone." No Missionary had ever before been sent there. But now, one in the Colony of New Jersey, and that one Mr. Thompson, devoted himself to that work, and at once hastened to that field. The first Missionary to Africa from this country, and at so early a day,—one, too, so self-sacrificing, deserves lasting remembrance.

In 1751, he became thus a travelling Missionary among the negroes in Guinea, with a stipend of £70 per annum. For six years, he discharged the duties of his station there. But sickness drove him from his post, and he returned to England. After his return, he published two Missionary Voyages, which he made whilst engaged in his Mission in Africa.

VIII.—PHILIP READING.

Mr. Reading was the son of the Rev. Mr. Reading, librarian of Zion College, England ; and was educated at Winchester School, and the University College, Oxford. He then emigrated to this country, and was a tutor for three years in a gentleman's family in Pennsylvania. Returning then to England, after receiving Holy Orders, he was licensed by the Bishop of London for Pennsylvania, (under which name, Delaware was then included,) April 7, 1746 ; and was sent back by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, as a Missionary to Apoquinimink, the Southern district of New Castle County, Delaware. As specimens of his success, in June, 1750, he writes, that in the preceding nine months, he had baptized 1 white adult, and 87 children, of whom 19 were negroes. These last show, that that class were not neglected by him in his ministry. In June, 1761, eleven years after, he writes, that in eight months he had baptized 1 adult, and 73 infants ; 8 of whom were negroes. The communicants were 63. Two years after this, a new and larger Church was built. He had the happiness to see his labors succeed to the whole extent which, under the circumstances, could be expected. This was in 1763, and so for years thereafter. But in 1776, July 28, the Church was shut

up ; because, as he writes, he could not incur the heavy guilt of perjury. His oaths of allegiance, and of canonical obedience, he could not violate, and without so doing his Church must be closed, and it was. In a little more than a year thereafter, in 1778, after a ministry of 32 years, he died through grief and despondency, a martyr to the Church of his affections.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

AN EXPOSITION OF THE EPISTLES OF SAINT PAUL TO THE GALATIANS AND COLOSSIANS, according to the Analogy of the Catholic Faith. By the Rev. MORGAN DIX, S. T. D. New York: 762 Broadway. 1864. 8vo. pp. 135.

The first impression of many a reader of this Commentary will be, its utter irreconcilability with the Lutheran doctrine of Justification by Faith. And yet that Lutheran doctrine is held by large numbers in the Church. It is held loosely, held undefinedly, held disconnectedly and so illogically, still it is held; and so far as such persons have any *theory* of Justification, this is it. It makes that Faith, to be a subjective, conscious feeling. It makes that feeling, to be a special gift of God. It makes that gift or calling, to be the result of a sovereign, unconditional decree on the part of God. It makes that decree to be effectual to the salvation of the elect. It makes this special gift of faith, this sovereign, unconditional decree, this Effectual Calling,—all to be the fruit of Christ's limited Atonement.

To these, the "elect," are applied not only the benefits of the Sacrifice of the Cross, but to them is imputed, also, the perfect Righteousness of Christ's perfect Obedience, so that they are, in God's sight, regarded as more righteous than if they had always kept the whole Law. (How this accords with the Scriptural doctrine of future degrees of reward, is another question.) As to the rest of mankind, the non-elect, adults and infants, they have no right to use any of the Means of Grace, no Atonement has been made for them, and they are, of necessity, hopelessly and forever lost. This doctrine is bearing its legitimate fruits. It has filled New England with Edwardsism, and Emmonsism, and Taylorism, and Tylerism, and Parkerism, and Unitarianism, through all its shades of Unbelief; it is filling the West and the Northwest, as it has filled Germany and Holland, with distrust of all Creeds, and has resulted in a wide-spread Infidelity.

Now, how this doctrine of Justification, as it has been taught and held, differs, and it does differ, from the doctrine of "Justification by Faith only," as taught in our Article XI, we have no room here to show; the reader can trace that distinction in the writings of such men as Lawrence, and Hardwick, and Browne. But the difference between the Church doctrine and the Romish doctrine of Justification, first by Infusion, and then of a progressive Justification by Human Merit and Good Works, is one of vital importance; as is, also, the distinction between the Church and the Socinian doctrines upon this point. And yet it is certain that the terms "Justify," and "Justification," and "Faith," are used in Holy Scripture, and used freely, as also in the writings of the early Fathers, not only in a wider, but a different sense, from that in which they are employed, not only in Romish, but in Lutheran and Calvinistic phraseology. It will help us to

understand the doctrine of the Church, if we can rid ourselves of certain metaphysical technicalities; if we will remember, that Faith includes, within itself, Repentance, and Obedience, and Charity or Love, and Hope, as the old writers tell us; and that the whole System is now one of Grace, and not of Debt or Desert. In this light, St. James' positive declaration, that "by works a man is justified, and not by faith only," is perfectly simple, and reconcilable with the teaching of St. Paul.

We dwell the longer upon this point, because it is that where Dr. Dix's Commentary will be most in danger of being misunderstood. His language has too much the appearance of a Theory; of grouping and dove-tailing into measured and exact relations and proportions, things which man has no power thus to adjust. He says, Justification "can only be comprehended by reference to its several causes, agents, and conditions, of which we count the following:

(1.) THE FINAL CAUSE; (2.) THE MERITORIOUS CAUSE; (3.) THE FORMAL CAUSE; (4.) THE EFFICIENT CAUSE; (5.) THE INSTRUMENTAL MEANS; (6.) THE SUBJECTIVE CONDITIONS." Undoubtedly this comprehensive signification of the term, and it is not a new one, enables the author to meet objections which may be brought against any one of its specific definitions. How incomplete and unscriptural the Lutheran theory is, the author might well have shown; but after the exhaustive controversies, not only in the Roman Church, but of Hooker and Beveridge and Andrewes, and of Laud and Taylor and Bull, which have distracted the English Church upon this great subject, after the long-established use of certain technical phrases, which have been accepted on the one side or on the other, and which it is impossible to employ now, shorn of that meaning, we are sure that many Churchmen will demur to accepting Dr. Dix's theory, *as such*.

In glancing at the Commentary, we notice numerous passages which are, at least, open to criticism. Thus, he says, that whenever St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Colossians, uses the term "Law, he means the Mosaic Covenant, the Jewish System." And so, also, in writing so earnestly and truthfully against the popular error of making "Subjective Feelings" the only "Evidence and Proof of Spiritual Conditions," he will be thought by some to undervalue those Moral Affections, on which not only Moral Conduct is of necessity predicated, but on and by which the Spiritual benefits of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper are conditioned. He says, "The Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, is the evidence of God's continued favor. He assures us thereby, that we are very members incorporate in the Mystical Body of His Son; that the forgiveness of sin is renewed unto us; that we are partakers of His favor and goodness, and heirs, through hope, of His everlasting Kingdom. No subjective impressions should be allowed to weigh against this external evidence. It is not feeling which determines a man's spiritual state; and the feelings cannot constitute proof in the premises." * * * * "And since the work of Redemption is God's alone, and since the conveyance of the blessing to us is also His alone; since man has not wrought out his own salvation, and is powerless to bring it within his reach, and

secure it by his own efforts; the Evidence that Redemption has been wrought, and *that he has been made a partaker thereof, must be an external evidence*, against which no supposed internal evidence can, in its absence, justly weigh, and which no supposed internal evidence can, by its presence, materially corroborate." pp. 79-80.

Now, that there is a fundamental distinction in the conditions for a proper reception of the two Sacraments, Infant Baptism and the Lord's Supper, we shall not here attempt to show. The General Exhortation at the time of the Celebration of the Communion, the Confession then made, both so heart-searching, and the words addressed to each Communicant, all imply, not only an introspection of the most searching character, but the solemn language of warning which the Church addresses to the "unworthy" receivers thereof, shows that in her view, only on these "Subjective Conditions," should the Communicant dare approach and receive that Holy Sacrament. Let no one suppose, however, for a moment, that Dr. Dix, in his Commentary, undervalues or ignores the inward, hidden virtues and graces of the Christian life. The question is whether, in his theory of the Sacraments, they occupy the place which belong to them.

This volume will be widely read and thoroughly studied. There is in it enough of the fruits of consecrated learning to secure close attention. But there are "some things" in the writings of the Apostle, St. Paul, which St. Peter declared "hard to be understood;" and such they will, doubtless, remain, after the keenest wit and profoundest wisdom of man have been expended upon them.

A COMPENDIOUS HISTORY OF ENGLISH LITERATURE AND OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE, FROM THE NORMAN CONQUEST. With Numerous Specimens. By GEORGE L. CRAIK, LL. D., Professor of History and of English Literature, in Queen's College, Belfast. In two volumes, 8vo. New York: Charles Scribner. 1864. pp. 620, 581.

Professor Craik is not a compiler, nor a professional book-maker. His academic duties and his previous works, point him out as well qualified for the difficult and laborious work which he has now undertaken, and has so successfully performed. Nearly twenty years ago, he published "Sketches of the History of Literature and Learning in England," in six volumes, which is still quoted and referred to as a standard work. His "English of Shakespeare," being a philological commentary on *Julius Cæsar*, and his "Masterpieces of English Literature," in which he analyzes the works and lives of Spenser and Bacon,—these, and his other publications, show him to be a critic, philological, verbal, and æsthetic, of the highest order. The "Sketches of the History of Literature and Learning," &c., just mentioned, form the basis of the work now before us; which, indeed, include almost all that is valuable and germane, that he has heretofore written. The plan of the work can be best stated in his own words. He says:

"It is extremely simple, and resting not upon arbitrary but upon natural or real distinctions, gives us the only view of the subject that

can claim to be regarded as of a scientific character. In the earliest state in which it is known to us, the English is both a *homogeneous* and a *synthetic* language,—homogeneous in its vocabulary, synthetic in its grammatical structure. It has since, though of course always operated upon, like every thing human, by the law of gradual change, undergone only two decided revolutions; the first of which destroyed its synthetic, the second its homogeneous character. Thus, in its second form, it is still a homogeneous, but no longer a synthetic language; in its third, it is neither synthetic nor homogeneous, but has become both analytic in its grammar, and composite in its vocabulary. The forms may be conveniently designated; the first, that of Pure or Simple English; the second, that of Broken or Semi-English; the third, that of Mixed, or Compound, or Composite English. The first of the three stages through which the language has thus passed, may be considered to have come to an end in the eleventh century; the second, in the thirteenth century; the third, is that in which it still is."

He says, "That of the words in common use, both in speaking and in writing, which may be taken as about 10,000 in number, probably full a half are pure English; and that of those in common colloquial use, which may be about 5,000 in all, probably four-fifths are of native stock. And the 4,000 or 5,000 non-Roman words, that are in general use, (4,000 in our common speech, 5,000 in literary composition,) compose all the fundamental frame-work of the language, all that may be called its skeleton or bony structure, and also, perhaps, the better part of its muscular tissue."

As far as down to the close of the Second or Semi-English Period of English Literature, Professor Craik's work is rather synoptic and chronological, than critical. It is, however, a masterly grouping of facts, and presents what has been usually in the hands of other authors, a chaotic mass of details, in a clearly and well arranged order. This portion of the work occupies about 260 pages of the First Volume. But, commencing with the time of Chaucer, in the middle of the fourteenth century, the work is thoroughly critical and well nigh exhaustive. "It is only great names, and great works, which make a literature," he says; and he devotes the larger share of his space to such names as Chaucer, Spenser, Shakespeare, Bacon, Milton, Dryden, Pope, Burke, &c. &c. Yet he does not pass by writers in the second grade, and even lower in the scale, who have taken their place in the literature of their respective times. This essayic and biographical character of the work is a special characteristic, making it not only a biographical Dictionary, and answering all the purposes of an Encyclopedia, but also agreeable reading. Throughout this portion of the work, we have many specimens of fine writing, showing not unfrequently great discrimination in judgment, and yet great delicacy in handling. The styles of Richardson, Fielding, and Smollet, the portrait of Burke, the criticism on Wordsworth, the estimate of "the Victorian Age," with its superior prose and its inferior verse, its preponderance of narrative, &c., &c., are all admirable. A copious Index is appended to the last volume, and, on the whole, we recommend the work, as by far the most complete and most

readable History of our Language and Literature that has yet appeared. We hope Mr. Scribner will be well rewarded for bringing out so valuable a treasure. He certainly deserves it at the hands of American scholars.

THE LIFE OF JESUS; By ERNEST RENAN, Membre de L'Institut. Translated from the original French by CHARLES EDWIN WILBUR. New York: Carleton.

M. Renan, born in 1823, was educated for the Romish Church, and had already received the tonsure and minor Orders, when the *Theologia Moralis* of that System shocked and disgusted him, as well it might, and he left the Seminary of St. Sulpice, poisoned by the philosophy of Hegel. He had already studied thoroughly the Hebrew and Semitic Languages, and had written upon them. In 1860, he was sent to explore the antiquities of Phœnicia; and spending a Summer on the heights of Libanus, he beguiled his weary hours by writing this "Life of Jesus." A hundred thousand copies of it, it is said, were sold in France, soon after its appearance. We are glad to see the book, just as we are glad to see the sleek and well-bred villain, who sneaks about our houses and gains admission to our firesides, unmask himself, and reveal his real character as a highwayman and a desperado. M. Renan is nothing more or less than Colenso and the "Essayists," in their true garb. He says boldly, what they only insinuate, and would say if they dare. He is the more honest and respectable of the two classes of enemies of Christ and of His Church.

As to the book itself, the attempt of M. Renan to exhibit the apparent inconsistencies in the Life of our Blessed Lord as given by the Four Evangelists, contains nothing that is new; and yet, the magisterial air with which he alludes to them, and the audacity with which he attempts to excuse them, and apologizes for them, only reveal the depth of his impudence and hate. The Blessed Saviour, Himself, he regards as a fanatical impostor, who, having carefully read the ancient Prophecies, takes advantage of a popular delusion to palm himself off as the long expected "Deliverer," "the Son of Man," the "true Messiah." But there was no announcement of angels to the shepherds of Bethlehem of the Saviour's birth; there was no Star in the East that guided them to the manger where He lay; there was no coming of the Wise Men of the East with their votive treasures of gold and frankincense and myrrh; there was, in fact, no Bethlehem, no manger, no going to Jerusalem to be taxed. As there was, abroad, a popular belief in Miracles, so, he says, Jesus Christ pretended to work them. He says: "Almost all the Miracles which Jesus *thought he performed*, appear to have been Miracles of healing." Yet there was no Miracle after all. Either the persons were not really sick, or only to that degree that "the pleasure of seeing Him" was sufficient to heal them. "He gives what He can, a smile, a hope, and that is not unavailing." Several of the Miracles he scoffs at, as a piece of downright absurdity. Thus "Lazarus," it is suggested, "still pale from his sickness, caused himself to be swathed in grave clothes, as one dead, and shut up in

his family tomb," and so "*something took place at Bethany, which was regarded as a resurrection !*" And as to the Resurrection of our Blessed Lord, he has the effrontery to say, "So deep was the trace which He had left in the hearts of His disciples and of a few devoted women, that, for weeks to come [after His crucifixion] He was to them living and consoling." And the suggestion is intimated, that "enthusiasm, always credulous, afterwards generated the mass of accounts by which faith in the resurrection was sought to be established," and this remarkable chapter is thus coolly concluded :—

"This, for want of peremptory evidence, we shall never know. We may say, however, that the strong imagination of Mary Magdalene here enacted a principal part. Divine power of love! Sacred moments, in which the passion of an hallucinated woman gives to the world a resurrected God!"

Again we say, we are not sorry to see this work; and for the reasons which we have already named. There are German text-books used in Theological seminaries in this country, which are reputed Orthodox, that contain, or imply, all that M. Renan has so blasphemously published. And the Clergy of the Church, who cannot and will not keep silent at such treachery, who are true and loyal to the standards which they are sworn to defend, hard-working and self-sacrificing as they are, are not infrequently branded as wanting in "vital godliness." It is high time all this were put an end to.

M. Renan's book needs no answer. It deserves none. It contains nothing that is new. It is only the old infidel refrain, as old as Christianity, sung by a very clever Frenchman. That is all.

THIRTY POEMS. By WILLIAM CULLEN BRYANT. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1864. 12mo. pp. 222.

It is now almost half a century since Bryant gave *THANATOPSIS* to the world; it was written when he was 18 or 19 years of age, and was published in the *North American Review* for 1816. No other poet, we think, has won so high a reputation, and yet written so little. He is emphatically the Poet of Nature and of Humanity, and his most beautiful lines are those in which he is the interpreter of the Natural World and of the Moral Sentiments. There is such a freshness and naturalness in his pictures, such a delicate beauty of versification and exquisite finish of style, such an entire absence of everything that is common-place, or tawdry, or superfluous, or morbid, or affected, that one wonders how a man who for thirty years has battled so resolutely with politics as a New York Editor, has, at the same time, preserved so calm and unruffled a brow, and that, at the age of three-score and ten, he is as sensitive to the touch of beauty, as when, in youth, he wrote the immortal Poem which gave him such notoriety. Some of these *THIRTY POEMS* have already appeared in the Newspapers. "Waiting by the Gate," represents old age watching the mighty caravan of the living, as it passes on to the regions of the dead. "The Snow Shower" is an exquisite piece of word-painting. How true to Nature are the following :—

" See how in a living swarm they come
 From the chambers beyond that misty veil;
 Some hover a while in air, and some
 Rush prone from the sky like summer hail.
 All dropping swiftly or settling slow,
 Meet, and are still in the depths below;
 Flake after flake
 Dissolved in the dark and silent lake.

" Here delicate snow-stars, out of the cloud,
 Come floating downward in airy play,
 Like spangles dropped from the glistening crowd
 That whiten by night the milky way;
 There broader and burlier masses fall;
 The sullen water buries them all—
 Flake after flake—
 All drowned in the dark and silent lake.

THE POEMS OF ROBERT LOWELL. Author of "New Priest in Conception Bay." A new Edition, with many new Poems. Boston: E. P. Dutton & Co.. 1864. 12mo. pp. 206.

The many admirers of Mr. Lowell will be glad to welcome this dainty looking volume, a new edition of his Poems, published, we are pleased to see, in the very best style of the Riverside Press. The delicate fancy, the vivid imagination, the æsthetic culture, the fire of fresh and genuine true feeling, the marks and fruitage of varied and careful reading, are all, and most of all, we think, in the later Poems, bathed and mellowed by the shadow of the Cross. If we were to quote, it would be, perhaps, from those beautiful lines, "A Communing with God before entering into Holy Orders."

MUSIC OF THE BIBLE; or, Explanatory Notes upon those passages in the Sacred Scriptures which relate to Music, including a brief view of Hebrew Poetry. By ENOCH HUTCHINSON. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1864. 8vo. pp. 513.

This large volume indicates much industry and considerable research on the part of the author. A large portion of the work is filled with extracts from the Old and New Testaments, and with comments upon them, in which Music, and the use of Musical instruments, are mentioned or indicated. Illustrative cuts, also, are freely given, copied from the ruins of Ancient Nations, mostly of Egypt, showing the different kinds, shape, &c., of ancient Musical instruments. The subject of Music itself, however, as a Science, the author has evidently not made a study; and the work is barren of such conclusions as the inquiring student would naturally look for. The Music of the Hebrew Worship, the Music of the Ancient Christians, the introduction of the Gregorian and Ambrosian Music, the gradual adoption of Melody and Harmony,—points like these, of great importance now, as bearing upon the subject of true Church Music, are not touched. The work is valuable for the purposes for which it was written.

THE IMITATION OF CHRIST. Four Books. By THOMAS A KEMPIS, Boston : E. P. Dutton & Co. 1864. 12mo. pp 347.

This beautiful edition of the "Imitation of Christ," we would speak of in other respects than as a book to be used. It is indeed a book for the closet and for the heart's holiest hours. The first thought suggested is, that it is a work which the present age could not produce. The popular Christianity of the Sects could not do it; nor could the modern type of Roman Catholicism. The abnegation of self; the depth of humility and contrition; the spirit in it, lifted so far above the world, its frowns, its flatteries, its follies, its pleasures, its rewards; the absorbing power of the love of Christ in the soul; the alone reliance on Christ's Atoning Sacrifice for pardon; the fellowship in His Sufferings; the longing to follow Him through all the *Via Dolorosa* of His self-denial, and shame, and sorrow; the blessedness of Communion with Him, in Meditation, and Prayer, and the Holy Sacrament; the deep work of preparation before receiving that Sacrament; all this, and much more, breathes from the pages of this wonderful book. The Book is indeed a study. What are the doctrines which are interwoven into this work, which made Thomas à Kempis what he was? It is a curious question, and an important one. We have answered it in part already. There are in it traces of the corruption of the Primitive Faith, which then abounded; but, as a whole, it is so excellent that all sorts of believers have united in praising it; and all may use it with profit. We need just such a Christianity, in these days of worldly wisdom and fashionable idolatry. Hallam, in his "Literature of Europe," said, more than twenty years ago, that this work had then appeared in eighteen hundred editions.

READINGS FOR EVERY DAY IN LENT. Compiled from the writings of Bishop Jeremy Taylor. By the author of "Amy Herbert." New York : H. B. Durand. 1864. 12mo. pp. 360.

It is sufficient to indicate the source of these compilations and the name of the compiler, Miss Sewell, to draw to this new edition the attention of our readers. We hope the work will be as extensively used in our own as it is in the English Church.

INTELLECTUAL PHILOSOPHY : Analytical, Synthetical and Practical. By HUBBARD WINSLOW, D. D., Author of "Moral Philosophy," &c. Eighth Edition, with Additions, bringing the Science down to the latest views. Boston : Brewer & Tileston. 1863. 12mo. pp. 442.

In a previous number of this Review, (Vol. xii, p. 416,) we examined Dr. Winslow's work on Moral Philosophy, and stated the characteristics of its teachings. The present work, which now appears in the eighth edition, is already well known to the public. Its special value is in its eclectic character. The author avoids, as far as practicable, technical terms, and gives in popular language the generally accepted facts of Intellectual Philosophy, with allusions and references here and there to the two great Schools, the Idealists and the Sensationalists, into which the world always has been and always will be di-

vided. His Sixth Part, in which he presents a "Summary View of the leading Philosophical Schools," is sufficiently complete to be of great service to the beginner; although the admirers of Hamilton and Mansel, so far from according with his statements as to their position, will say that he has not done them justice. Appended to each Chapter is a list of Questions for the use of Schools.

A GUIDE TO THE HOLY COMMUNION; or the great duty of frequenting the Christian Sacrifice: with suitable Devotions. By Robert Nelson, Esq. Adapted to the use of the Church in the United States. With an Appendix. By the Rev. J. W. Shackelford, Rector of the House of Prayer, Newark, N. J. New York: H. B. Durand. 1864. 18mo. pp. 122.

Notwithstanding the century and a half which has passed since the devout Mr. Nelson prepared this Guide to the Holy Communion, it still remains unsurpassed in value for the thoroughness of preparation on the part of the communicant which the work contemplates, and the richness of the Devotions and Meditations which the author has prepared. Indeed, Mr. Nelson says, that the devotional part owes its original, in some measure, to the Ancient Liturgies, from which many a pious thought and warm expression were derived. The present is a cheap edition.

A POPULAR HAND-BOOK OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By GEORGE CUMMING McWHORTER. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1864. 12mo. pp. 295.

There are multitudes of persons, such as Sunday School and Bible-Class teachers, and even Ministers and Lecturers, who will welcome this volume; for it furnishes them, in compact form, just that information concerning the New Testament, which they need, and which we believe they cannot find so well presented and so conveniently arranged any where else. Its first Chapters are devoted, to the Mutual Relation of the Old and New Testaments; the Genuineness, Authenticity and Canonicity of the New Testament; the Ancient Manuscripts of the New Testament; the Ancient Versions; and various editions of the Greek Testament. In the later Chapters, Mr. McWhorter gives a summary account of each of the Books of the New Testament. The tone of the book is throughout healthful, which is no small matter in these days of babbling impiety; and for the specific purpose for which it was prepared, and which is indicated by its title, it may be warmly recommended. We are sorry to see, even in statements of fact, that the author has quoted so freely from Dean Alford; because the same information might have been gained from less questionable sources. The Dean is a treacherous guide, and his principles of reasoning are semi-Rationalistic. On the question of the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews, we believe Dean Alford is altogether wrong in denying it to St. Paul; and that both the external and internal evidence prove it to be the production of that Apostle. There is no writer of any authority in the Oriental Church, who does not admit

the Pauline origin of this Epistle. We have an able paper before us, on this subject, which we may give hereafter.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY, CORRESPONDENCE, ETC., OF LYMAN BEECHER, D. D. Edited by CHARLES BEECHER. With illustrations. In two volumes. New York: Harper & Brothers. Vol. I. 12mo. pp. 563. 1864.

In some respects this Autobiography will cause disappointment. Many will examine it to trace the inner life and growth of a man who, in his day, was in one way or another almost constantly before the public. Yet what will they say when they find him gravely recording, for the public eye, that one of his ancestors was "able to lift a barrel of cider and drink out of the bung-hole;" that another was "only able to lift a barrel of cider into a cart;" that his father "could lift a barrel of cider and carry it into the cellar;" that "Aunt Esther had known him, at least twelve times, come in from the barn and sit down on a coat-pocket full of eggs, jump up, and say, Oh, wife;" that himself "was a seven month child." He says, "I used to have the heart-burn after eating puddings and pies, and Aunt Benton had a notion I was weakly. Lyman, she would say, won't you go into the milk-room, and get a piece of cake? You don't look well." His Uncle Williston was a preacher, and turned his text, "this way and that, and scratched it as a hen does an ear of corn," &c., &c., &c., &c. The volume is full of such silly and disgusting twaddle and puerilities. There is, besides, a constant exhibition of an intensely egotistical temper, an overweening self-conceit, indicating not merely a lack of native delicacy and refinement, and a want of social culture, but the absence of that modesty which always characterizes the true scholar. The truth is, Dr. Beecher had neither the talent, or learning, to contribute anything to that period of New England History which will live. In College, his scholarship was so far below mediocrity, that he had not even a nominal appointment, and his Autobiography exhibits him at this period, as rude, undisciplined and unfurnished. It was as a sensational Preacher and Speaker, that he afterwards made his mark. He could "blow and strike" before a popular assembly with prodigious effect; but in the great Calvinistic Controversy, dialectic argument, acute metaphysical reasoning, and learned controversy, were beyond his depth.

There are some things in this Autobiography which are amusing to us as Churchmen. It was in 1818 that Connecticut was revolutionized; the Standing Order lost the exceptional power to tax everybody to support Congregationalism, and Toleration for the first time was allowed to Churchmen and other "dissenters." It was at this time that Bishop Hobart was in temporary charge of the Diocese of Connecticut, and the Autobiography has an allusion, in a letter to Dr. Taylor, to the desperate efforts of Taylor, Tyler, Nettleton and others to counteract Bishop Hobart's influence, and perpetuate their own, by the publication of Anonymous Tracts, written, nobody knew by whom, published, nobody knew where, and yet scattered everywhere over the State. This is a curious portion of Connecticut Church History. We

have one of those Tracts before us, "A SERIOUS CALL;" which we will not characterize as it deserves; but no "Jesuitical pious fraud" was ever perpetrated more utterly flagrant and unprincipled. These "Tracts," for attack and defense, as Dr. Beecher describes them, did not ruin Bishop Hobart, nor destroy the Church; on the contrary, the weapon did more execution at its breech than its muzzle, as many an incident would show. Dr. Beecher alludes to this battle against the Church, and we are inclined to leave on record some notes of the struggle, for which now we have no room. We shall refer to that matter again.

THE SECTIONAL CONTROVERSY: or Passages in the History of the United States, including the Causes of the War between the Sections. By WM. CHAUNCEY FOWLER, LL. D. New York: Charles Scribner, 124 Grand street. 1863. 8vo. pp. 269.

The learned author was led to investigate the following questions:

I. Is the traditional sentiment in favor of the Union dying out in the hearts of the people of the States?

II. Is the bond of Union, namely, the Constitution, growing weaker in the respect and confidence of politicians?

III. As a consequence, are the States drifting along, to some extent unconsciously, toward disunion?

IV. What are the causes of this alarming condition of the country?

V. Which section of the Union is responsible for the operation of these causes?

In answer to these inquiries, Prof. Fowler has arranged his materials in chronological order, and has brought distinctly into view the prominent questions in dispute between the two sections, the North and the South, in the successive eras, from the first settlement of the country down to the close of President Buchanan's Administration. The result of all this, is an invaluable book. Prof. Fowler (the author of an able English Grammar noticed in a previous Volume of this Review,) is thoroughly competent to his work. He has long been familiar with many of the leading men of the country, and he has evidently aimed at the strictest impartiality. The volume before us shows that there has been a tendency existing all along, and especially in these our times—a tendency to merge our Federal into a Consolidated Government, to the utter annihilation of certain State and individual rights. The facts so abundantly given by Prof. Fowler show, beyond a question, what the character of our Government was, in the estimation and design of its founders. Whether they were right or wrong, in their theory of Government, is another question altogether. But all the casuistry, and quibbling, and petty pleading in the world, cannot set aside the fact that in a certain, a real, and most important sense, the several States have never lost their integral existence, their independence and their sovereignty. The volume before us contains a digest of facts, too generally forgotten or unknown, showing how the sectional and diverse interests of the country have come into collision, ever since the Government was first established.

CANTONIANA: A Series of Essays on Life, Literature, and Manners. By SIR E. BULWER LYTTON, Bart. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1864. 12mo. pp. 442.

The readers of Blackwood will be pleased to meet with these papers of Bulwer, in a volume by themselves. A writer who has identified himself so long and so closely with the living literature of his age, who has evidently studied so narrowly the life and manners of the world in which he moves, can hardly have failed to be genial, thoughtful, and interesting, in a work like this, as he calls it, "in the old-fashioned field of belles-lettres."

PELAYO: An Epic of the olden Moorish Time. By ELIZABETH T. PORTER BEACH. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1864. 12mo. pp. 424.

The beautiful style in which this volume is published—paper, typography, and especially its illustrations—leaves nothing to be desired. The fair writer has seized hold of one or two of the most romantic legends of Spanish history, and woven them into verse. Count Julian, stung with a sense of private wrong, became traitor not only to the guilty Don Roderick, whom he aided to dethrone, but to his religion also, and betrayed both into the hands of the Moors. The versification is easy and flowing, and occasionally exceedingly spirited. We have marked several passages, which our want of space prevents transcribing.

LIFE OF ARCHBISHOP LAUD. By JOHN N. NORTON. Rector of Ascension Church, Frankfort, Ky. Author of "Life of Bishop Chase," &c., &c. Boston: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1864. 12mo. pp. 269.

There are many reasons why a Life, and this Life, of Archbishop Laud, should be scattered everywhere over the Church. Even our Church literature, so far as we know, contains no popular corrective of that persistent misrepresentation which the Puritan party continues to fasten upon his memory. *Proprium humani ingenii est odire quem laeseris*. Mr. Norton has told the story of the Archbishop well, but, of course, very briefly. The leading facts in his life are given, and that is all that is possible within so brief a compass.

It is difficult now to estimate correctly all the forces which conspired together to blacken the character, and finally to take the life of Archbishop Laud. Laud was a friend, adviser, and supporter of the established royal Government: The Puritans thirsted for supreme political power, and finally obtained it at the price of his head. Laud was a believer in the Faith of the Primitive Creeds: the Puritans believed in the arbitrary doctrines of John Calvin. Laud believed in a Primitive, Catholic, Visible Church, and sought to perpetuate it in England, restored and reformed: the Puritans believed in an invisible Church of the Elect, and claimed themselves to be the Elect, and determined to destroy the old Church of England, root and branch.

Laud held strong views of Church prerogatives and church authority ; so did the Puritans. Laud loved and venerated Symbolism, and the ancient Rites and Ceremonies of the Church : the Puritans abominated and trampled upon them. In all this, we see some of the causes of that deep, bitter hate against Archbishop Laud, among the early Puritans which, at last, by a judicial and illegal murder, brought him to the block. To say that he was a Papist, is to slander him and falsify history. To doubt that he was an earnestly religious and devout man, none can do, who will study his life impartially.

INSTRUCTION AND ENCOURAGEMENT FOR LENT. By the Rev. J. H. HOBART, D. D. New York : H. B. Durand. 1864. 12mo. pp. 223.

We regret that a new edition of this thoughtful book came to hand so late in the Lenten Season. It is full of stirring suggestions, and clear delineations of the nature and methods of the Christian Life, and of encouragements to it.

HOUSEHOLD PRAYERS, with Psalms and Hymns, for the Church in the House. By a COUNTRY CLERGYMAN. Doylestown, Penn : J. D. Mendenhall. 1864. 12mo. pp. 52.

The plan of this little Manual is new ; at least, it has not been adopted in any volume of Family Prayers that we have seen. It provides a responsive Service, in which all the members of the Family are expected to take a part. The Collects of the Prayer Book are all given in the Appendix, as are also several Occasional Prayers, and a Collection of Psalms and Hymns. It seems to us the Service is too meagre, there being but a single Morning and Evening Prayer. This is in part obviated, however, by the Special Prayers given in the margin. The plan, itself, of the work is excellent, and the execution, so far as carried out, seems to us very good.

CHRISTIAN UNION AND THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH. Six Letters to Protestant Christians. By a Presbyterian of the Diocese of Western New York. New York : 762 Broadway. 1863. 12mo. pp. 122.

The writer of this little book says, he lives in a town where "there are *eleven* Protestant Denominations, all different from each other, which know little of each other's affairs, and have little if any Christian fellowship." His Six Letters are written in a popular style ; he states, with great plainness, the arguments for Unity ; he meets the common pleas for dissension, and presents the reasons why the principles of the Protestant Episcopal Church must be the basis on which a restoration to Unity will be effected. It is a good book to put into the hands of persons who are disturbed by the distracted condition of Christendom.

HARPER'S PICTORIAL HISTORY OF THE GREAT REBELLION.

No. 6 of this work has been executed in the same beautiful style with those which have preceded it. It is a continuous and carefully

prepared history of the Rebellion, published in the form and size of Harper's Weekly, and copiously illustrated with battle scenes, maps, portraits, and engravings of various kinds.

The CHURCH BOOK SOCIETY, 762 Broadway, sends us the following new and nice Books:—

1. THE STORY OF A LITTLE FIR TREE. By MRS. BRADLEY. 12mo. pp. 67.
2. FOLD OF THE GOOD SHEPHERD SERIES. (No. I.) The Christ-mas Present. (No. II.) The Rope Makers.
3. KATIE EVELYN STORIES. By CONSTANCE GRAHAM. No. I. Katie a Clock. No. II. Katie a Servant. No. III. Katie a Lamb. No. IV. Katie a Soldier. No. V. Katie a Steward. No. VI. Katie a Cross-bearer.
4. THE BUDS OF PROMISE SERIES. No. I. Hidden Beauty. No. II. The Dewdrop's Lesson to the Rosebud. No. III. What the Wind taught the Flowers. No. IV. The Voice of the Passion Flower. No. V. Sophie's Dream. No. VI. Lokka.

THE LIFE AND CORRESPONDENCE OF THEODORE PARKER. By JOHN WEISS. With two portraits on steel, fac simile of handwriting, and 19 wood engravings. 2 vols. 8vo. 1008 pp. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1864.

We have already said all that we care to say of Theodore Parker, in our previous Articles on the Newest kind of New England Theology. We express here, however, the opinion which the work of his biographer fully confirms, that Mr. Parker owed his reputation far more to the fact that he was a representative man of the inevitable tendencies and results of New England theology, or philosophy, or thinking, or whatever else it may be called, than to his inherent, solid merits. We notice this American edition for another reason. We mean, the remarkable omissions in the American, from the English edition, of which it is in other respects a reprint. Mr. Parker was in the habit of expressing himself, not only concerning things, but men, with the most reckless frankness. Whether he was right, or wrong, is another question. But we do say, if his Life and Correspondence was to be reprinted at all in this country, the public have a right to know what Mr. Parker thought, not of some, but of all the men, concerning whom he delivered his judgment. And yet, in the American edition, the severest language which even Mr. Parker was capable of using, is retained concerning a certain class of men, while his judgments concerning other men, are stricken out. Thus, concerning Horace Greeley, Mr. Parker writes, in the English edition:—

"Greeley is not fit for a leader. He is capricious, crotchety, full of whims, and wrong-headed. How he talks on political economy,

which he knows so little about! How he took the side of Russia in the Crimean war! How is he now? Unwilling to object to the admission of a new slave State; and what a mean defense he makes of a mean speech! He is honest, I think, but pitiaibly weak for a man in such a position." * * *

"Daniel Webster stood on higher anti-slavery ground than Abraham Lincoln now (1858). Greeley's conduct, I think, is base. I never had any confidence in him. He has no talent for a leader."

And yet, not a word of this in the American edition. So, also, concerning the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, Mr. Parker writes, when he can be allowed to tell the public what he thinks, as follows:—

"Beecher showed that part of him which is Jesuitical—not so small a part as I could wish it was. How ridiculous for Sharp's Rifle Beecher to be preaching such stuff at this time! But he can't stand up straight unless he have something as big as the Plymouth church to lean against. Let us be thankful for all the good he does and is, but not ask of him what he has not to give. All men are not born to be heroes." But Mr. Parker is not permitted to say this to the American people! Is this honest? Is it just to the memory of Mr. Parker? Is it just to the American people themselves?

JULIA OF BAÏÆ; Or the days of Nero. A Story of the Martyrs.

By the Rev. JOHN W. BROWN, Author of "The Merchant's Daughter," etc. New York: Church Book Society. 1864. 16mo. pp. 358.

This new edition of "Julia of Baïæ," awakens feelings of melancholy interest, as it recalls so freshly the memory of the Author, with whom our relations were too intimate to be soon forgotten. The present was one of his best works; and is, perhaps, the very best specimen of his varied powers as a writer. Behind a very quiet exterior of countenance and manner, there was a strength of feeling and expression, which needed but a fitting opportunity to surprise even his intimate friends. This Story of the Martyrs in the days of Nero, will be found interesting and instructive.

THE PRINCIPLES OF CHURCH HISTORY. Adapted to the Young.

By a Presbyterian of the Diocese of North Carolina. New York: H. B. Durand. 1863. 12mo. pp. 284.

The author had long been convinced of the want of a good Church History for use in our Sunday and Church Schools and Bible Classes, and for popular reading. He has endeavored to meet that want in this volume. It is, of course, exceedingly summary, as it attempts to cover the whole ground, down to the close of the Fourth Century. It is, indeed, almost too summary. Yet it is carefully written, is moderate in tone, it touches upon nearly all the prominent features of Church History in that most important period, and is, we think, the most satisfactory book for the purpose intended that has yet appeared.

The following publications have been received :—

ELEANOR'S VICTORY. A Novel. By M. E. BRADDON, Author of "Aurora Floyd," &c. With Illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1863. 8vo. pp. 188.

VERY HARD CASH. A Novel. By CHARLES READE, Author of "Love me little love me long," &c. With Illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1864. 8vo. pp. 258.

JERRY; or the Sailor-Boy Ashore. Being the Seventh—a Fragment—in the Series of the "Aimwell Stories." By WALTER AIMWELL. To which is added a Memoir of the Author, with a Likeness. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1864. 16mo. pp. 224.

ON PICKET DUTY, and other Tales. By L. M. ALCOTT. Boston: JAMES REDPATH. 1864. 16mo. pp. 96.

A HAND-BOOK FOR A CHRISTIAN CHILD. By REV. O. WITHERSPOON. Rector of St. John's Church, Buffalo, N. Y. 18mo. pp. 64.

REV. DR. C. H. HALL'S SERMON, in Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C. "Deus Lux est." 1863.

REV. DR. MORGAN DIX'S SERMON, at Consecration of St John's Chapel, Hobart College, Oct. 29, 1863. "Christ the Light of the World."

REV. DR. WORTHINGTON'S SERMON, before the General Assembly of Missouri, Nov. 26, 1863.

REV. J. M. PECK'S SERMON, in Trinity Church, Claremont, N. H., Jan. 24, 1864. "The Sin of Judging."

REV. DR. VAN DEUSEN'S ADDRESS, to the Parishioners of St. Peter's Church, Pittsburg, Penn.

REV. A. T. TWING'S FAREWELL SERMON, in Trinity Church, Lansingburgh, N. Y., Nov. 29, 1863.

REV. J. T. WORTHINGTON'S CONVENTION SERMON, in Christ Church, Kirkwood, Missouri, May 28, 1863.

THE REV. J. H. EGAR'S DEFENCE of the Doctrine of the Trinity, against J. F. C. Boston. 1864.

THE REV. DANIEL WASHBURN'S SERMON, in Trinity Church, Philadelphia. The National Thanksgiving. Nov. 26, 1863.

REV. J. H. MCKNIGHT'S HISTORICAL SKETCH, of Christ Church, Springfield, Mass., Nov. 29, 1863.

REV. DR. E. HARWOOD'S SERMON, in Trinity Church, New Haven, Oct. 25, 1863. "Canaan, Shem and Japheth."

REV. DR. E. HARWOOD'S ADDRESS, on the late Frederick Croswell, in Trinity Church, New Haven, Nov. 1, 1863.

REV. DR. SHEDD'S SERMON. "The Guilt of the Pagan." Boston: 1864.

JAMES GALLATIN'S EXAMINATION of the National Debt, Taxation, Currency, and Banking System of the United States. New York: 1864. 8vo. pp. 61.

SECOND ANNUAL CATALOGUE of St. Stephen's College, Annandale, N. Y. 1863-4.

REGISTER of the College of St. James, Maryland. 1862.

NINETEENTH ANNIVERSARY SERMON and Report, in the Church of the Advent, Boston, Mass. By Rev. JAS. A. BOLLES, D. D. 1863.

REGISTER of Hobart College, Geneva N. Y. 1863-4.

FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT of St. Luke's Hospital, New York., Oct. 18, 1863.

FOURTEENTH ANNUAL REPORT of the Church Mission to the Public Institutions in City of New York. 1864.

REPORT, of the Anglo-Continental Society, for the year 1863.

TRINITY CHURCH CAROLS, for the Sunday School of Trinity Church, New York. 1863. 8vo. pp. 8.

ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.

SUMMARY OF HOME INTELLIGENCE.

ORDINATIONS.

DEACONS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Cook, Joseph,	Stevens,	Feb. 17, 1864,	St. James, Philadelphia, Penn.
Dutton, Ormond W.	Potter, H.	Dec. 20, 1863,	Holy Apostles, New York City.
Gray, Albert Z.	Potter, H.	Jan. 24, 1864,	Transfiguration, N. York City.
Reay, D. Brainerd,	Stevens,	Dec. 13, 1863,	Atonement, Philadelphia, Pa.
Reed, J. Sanders,	Stevens,	Feb. 17, 1864,	St. James, Philadelphia, Penn.
Rogers, Benjamin A.	Chase,	Dec. 6, 1863,	Trinity, Claremont, N. H.
Sherwood, L. Hinsdale,	McIlvaine,	Dec. 28, 1863,	Calvary, Clifton, Ohio.
Yahn, William,	Upfold,	Feb. 14, 1864,	Trinity, Michigan City, Indiana.

PRIESTS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Rev. Badger, Wm. H.	Odenheimer,	Dec. 20, 1863,	St. Mary's, Burlington, N. J.
" Battè, Algernon,	Talbot,	Dec. 27,	" Trinity, Omaha, Nebraska Te.
" Dake, Orsamus C.	Talbot,	Dec. 27,	" Trinity, Omaha, Nebraska Te.
" Eastwood, Benjamin,	Williams,	Dec. 19,	" Chapel, Middletown, Conn.
" Goddard, Edw. N.	Potter, H.	Dec. 11,	" Holy Innocents, Annandale, N. Y.
" Goodwin, Francis,	Williams,	Dec. 19,	" Chapel, Middletown, Conn.
" Hagar, Isaac A.	Talbot,	Dec. 20,	" St. Mary's, Nebraska City, Nebraska Territory.
" Hare, Chandler,	Stevens,	Feb. 17, 1864,	St. James, Philadelphia, Pa.
" Jackson, Lewis H.	Whittingham,	Mar. 6,	" Calvary, Baltimore, Md.
" James, G. N.	Kemper,	Feb. 21,	" Chapel, Delafield, Wis.
" Johnson,	Odenheimer,	Dec. 20, 1863,	St. Mary's, Burlington, N. J.
" Lane, Marcus,	McCoskry,	Jan. 10, 1864,	St. Luke's, Ypsilanti, Mich.
" Lewis, S. Seymour,	Odenheimer,	Dec. 20, 1863,	St. Mary's, Burlington, N. J.
" Morrow, Wm. B.	Potter, H.	Dec. 20,	" Holy Apostles, New York City, N. Y.
" Mulford, Jos. N.	Potter, A.	Jan. 24, 1864,	Zion, Spring Garden, Penn.
" Nelson, Henry W., Jr.	Williams,	Feb. 16,	" St. James, New London, Ct.
" Reid, Jas. D.	Potter, H.	Jan. 9,	" St. Michael's, Bloomingdale, N. Y.
" Rogers, Benjamin A.	Chase,	Dec. 7, 1863,	Trinity, Claremont, N. H.
" Philips, William,	Potter, A.	Feb. 7, 1864,	Redeemer, Philadelphia, Pa.
" Seabury, George,	Potter, H.	Dec. 20, 1863,	Holy Apostles, N. York City, N. Y.
" Stocking, Chas. H. W.	Potter, H.	Dec. 17,	" All Saints, Briar Cliff, N. Y.
" Vibbert, W. H.	Williams,	Oct. 28,	" Chapel, Middletown, Conn.
" Wainwright, F. C.	Potter, H.	Dec. 4,	" Bethesda, Saratoga Springs, N. Y.
" Yahn, William,	Upfold,	Feb. 21, 1864,	St. James, Chicago, Ill.

CONSECRATIONS.

Name.	Bishop.	Time.	Place.
Christ,	DeLancey,	Dec. 29, 1863,	Jordan, W. New York.
St. George's Chapel,	Potter, H.	Dec. 24, "	New York City, N. Y.
St. Luke's,	Chase,	Dec. 11, "	Charlestown, N. H.
St. Mark's,	DeLancey,	Dec. 26, "	Clark's Mills, W. New York.
St. Paul's,	Talbot,	Oct. 5, "	Virginia City, Nevada Ter.

OBITUARIES.

The REV. HENRY ZELL died at Redding, Conn., Nov. 25th, 1863, aged 54 years. He was born in Philadelphia; was ordained Deacon by Bishop Croes, in July, 1835; and labored in New Jersey, as Missionary, seven years, when he removed to Connecticut, and was connected with the Parishes in Harwinton, Wolcottville, Bethany and West Haven; and was Rector of Christ Church, Redding, at the time of his death.

The REV. JAMES MAY, D. D., died at Philadelphia, Penn., Dec. 18, 1863, aged 58 years. He was born in Chester county, Penn., October 1st, 1805; studied the Latin and Greek classics in Morristown Academy; entered Jefferson College, Pa., in 1822, and graduated with distinction in 1823; commenced the study of Law; and then entered the Theological Seminary at Alexandria, Va., in 1824; was ordained by Bishop White in 1827, and became Rector of St. Stephen's Parish, Wilkesbarre, Penn., where he remained ten years; in October, 1836, became Rector of St. Paul's Parish, Philadelphia, but his health failed, and he spent two years in Europe; in 1842 he became Professor of Pastoral Theology and Ecclesiastical History in the Seminary at Alexandria, Va., where he remained nearly twenty years. In 1861, the War broke up the Seminary, and he removed to Philadelphia, and became Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Systematic Divinity in the new Seminary there. He was a devout man, Calvinistic in doctrine, and as a scholar was well read in Greek and Latin and in modern Italian and French. His death called forth all the expressions of respect and affection which were due to his elevated character and position.

The Rev. L. WARD SMITH died at Germantown, Penn., Dec. 22, 1863, aged — years. He was born in Rochester, N. Y.; graduated at Yale College in 1839; entered upon civil life, and was a member of the New York Assembly in 1849; was appointed Adjutant-General of the State in 1851; was admitted to Deacon's Orders by Bishop DeLancey, in Christ Church, Rochester, W. N. Y., March 4, 1860; and Priest, by Bishop DeLancey, in Christ Church, Albion, W. N. Y., Feb. 20, 1862. He was Rector of Church, Germantown, at the time of his death.

The Rev. GEORGE A. SHELTON, D. D., Rector of St. James' Church, Newtown, L. I., died Dec. 27, 1863, aged 63 years.

The Rev. FREDERICK S. WILEY, formerly Rector of Christ Church, New York City, died at Florence, Italy, Jan. 20, 1864.

The Rev. THOMAS S. JUDD, Rector of Christ Church, Butternuts, N. Y., died at Butternuts, Jan. 20, 1864. He was a native of Farmington, Ct.

The Rev. HARRY FINCH died at Shrewsbury, N. J., Feb. 14, 1864, aged 66 years.

CONVERSIONS TO THE CHURCH.

Mr. GEORGE HOWELL, JR., lately a Baptist, has been admitted Candidate for Orders in Massachusetts.

On the 29th of December, 1863, Bishop De Lancey confirmed eleven persons in Jordan, W. N. Y., all of whom were converts to the Church.

The Rev. B. W. ATWELL, recently pastor of the Universalist Society of Newburyport, Mass., has renounced Universalism, and proposes to connect himself with the Church.

The Rev. W. H. MILBURN, the blind Methodist preacher, has applied to become Candidate for Holy Orders in the Diocese of New York.

Dr. WM. L. REYNOLDS, formerly a Lutheran Minister, was recently confirmed at Waukegan, Ill., and expects soon to be ordained Deacon.

Mr. OSCAR B. THAYER, formerly Methodist Minister at Dixon, Ill., recently made full acknowledgment of the invalidity of the Methodist ministry, and has applied to become Candidate for Holy Orders in the Church.

The Rev. WM. PHILIPS, lately ordained Priest in Philadelphia, was formerly of the German Reformed denomination.

The Rev. WM. YAHN, recently ordained by Bishop Upfold, was Pastor of the German Lutheran congregation in Valparaiso, Indiana. Nearly one hundred male and nearly two hundred female communicants came with him into the Church.

DOMESTIC MISSIONS.

The Domestic Committee have formed and sent over the Church a Plan, whereby to increase the regular contributions of the Church, to this important department of her missionary work. It implies systematic effort; pledged weekly contributions; frequent meetings for the dissemination of missionary intelligence; and an Annual Meeting with a Sermon, and plate collection. The Plan is a sensible and feasible one. There is wealth enough in the Church to double, treble, and quadruple, our present missionary operations, without the slightest strain or self-denial. Churchmen are more than ready to give, if the

duty be properly laid before them. But there must be no clap-trap. The work must have their full confidence. The Committee say, "In bringing forward this measure, the Domestic Committee are very sensible that it is not mere method that will give success to this or to any other plan. It is the constraining love of Christ, which must prompt to successful action; and where that love abounds, it will, as the gracious fruit of the Holy Spirit, inspire perseverance, self-denial, and holy zeal." Of course it rests mainly with the Clergy, their active interest, or their utter indifference, whether this or any other "Plan" is to be successful. Some of them, we fear, lack the moral courage to present this specific duty faithfully and earnestly.

FOREIGN MISSIONS.

The Foreign Committee have also sent out a Circular, containing an argument and stirring appeal for Foreign Missions; and also a Plan for a weekly "Five-Cent Collection." The Plan we understand is already working well.

DIOCESAN INTELLIGENCE.

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.—It appears by the *Catalogue* that there are now in the Junior Class, 19 students; in the Middle Class, 27; and in the Senior Class, 25; or *seventy-one* in all, belonging to thirteen Dioceses. New York leads, of course, with 42; Western New York comes next, with 12; New Jersey has 4; New Hampshire, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Illinois, each 2; and Maryland, Indiana, Kentucky, Virginia, and Ontario, (C. W.) each 1.

NEW YORK. ST. STEPHEN'S COLLEGE.—The Annual Matriculation of St. Stephen's College, Annandale, took place Jan. 6th, and 11 new names were added to the list of students. Another is on his way; and two others are expected. This will make the whole number 21. The prospects of the College were never fairer: and the Trustees are already beginning to talk about the necessity of soon enlarging the College building.

The first Protestant Episcopal Church edifice erected in New York City, by a German congregation, was recently consecrated with appropriate ceremonies. The building is located in East Fourteenth street, near First avenue. The society numbers about 350 communicants. The congregation formerly gathered at an English Church in Nineteenth street. The Rev. Charles Schramm is Rector.

MAINE. INTERESTING CELEBRATION.—The celebration of the 225th Anniversary of the planting of the first English Colony, North of Virginia, took place near Bath, Maine, Aug. 29th, 1863. On the 19th of August, 1607, George Popham, with one hundred others, landed at the mouth of the Sagadahoc River, and the Rev. Richard Seymour, Chaplain to the Colony, and also one of the Assistants, offered prayers and preached a sermon. Ten days should now be added to

that date, to make up for the change from Old to New Style, thus making the 29th of August the proper anniversary of this transaction.

The Government of the United States are now replacing a small battery near the mouth of the Sagadahoc, by a spacious granite fort. The Historical Society obtained permission to place memorial stones in a conspicuous position in this fort.

The Rt. Rev. George Burgess, D. D., Bishop of the Diocese of Maine, conducted the religious services, which were intended to be, as far as practicable, the same which the Chaplain of the Colony used more than two and a half centuries since. Printed slips of these services were distributed among the audience. The Metre Psalm, with which the services concluded, was especially appropriate to the occasion.

To Churchmen, there is a historical fact here of great value. The Rt. Rev. Mr. Ballard has well said, "That the first religious services of which any knowledge has been preserved, as having taken place in New England, were performed by the Chaplain of this colony; that these services were held in accordance with the ritual of the Church of England; that the minister who celebrated this worship and preached these sermons was a clergyman of that Church, deriving his authority for his sacred office from ordination by the hands of a Bishop of the same Church; and that these acts were performed at first on an island, and in the open air, and afterwards continuously in a Church near the Kennebec river, on the West side of one of the peninsulas of the coast, in the year 1607, *thirteen years before the landing of the colony on Plymouth Rock*, and some time before the Puritans left England to reside for a season in Holland."*

CONGREGATIONALISM IN CONNECTICUT.

At the General Association at Hartford, in June last, the following statistics appeared in the Reports presented:—

In 1862, 785 were added by profession, and 945 by letter, in all 1,830; 862 removed by death, 887 by letter, and 100 by discipline, in all 1849. The removals exceeded the additions by 119; the deaths exceeded the additions by profession by 77.

In respect to Infant Baptism, the Rev. Dr. R. G. Vermilye presented a very long and carefully prepared report on this subject, inquiring how its more general observance may be secured? He said,—The fact of a growing neglect is indisputable. In 1826, 76, or one-fourth of our 285 churches, with 7,677 members, or one-sixth of the whole, baptized no child. By various facts and calculations, it appears that at least five children to the hundred communicants in our churches should be baptized yearly. But in 1861, the actual number in the State was only one-third of that proportion. In the 14 churches, numbering more than 400 members each, the rate is below this average. In four Associations, the average is three to the 100, in nine it is two, and in

* Maine His. Coll. 177, 178.

two, only one per cent. There is no doubt a wide-spread and growing disregard of this ordinance.

The work of State evangelization was strongly urged upon the churches as a pressing duty. The explorations of the Rev. L. W. Bacon in 1860, and of the State Missionary during the past year, show, that in addition to the unconverted in our families, Sabbath schools, and congregations, there are many thousands of people, young and old, in families and neighborhoods, near our sanctuaries and sometimes far off on the outskirts of our parishes, and scattered everywhere through our Commonwealth, who do not attend the public means of grace, and to whom we must carry the Gospel, or they will perish as effectually as if they were in the interior of Africa.

The *Calendar* has the following synopsis of the "Minutes of the General Association of Connecticut" for 1863, which we give *verbatim et literatim* :

In 1862, the number of infants baptized in Fairfield County was three per cent. of the whole number of church members; in Hartford, Litchfield and New Haven counties, it was two per cent.; while in Middlesex, New London, Tolland and Windham counties, it was only one per cent. In 1862, 78 churches with 7,709 members did not baptize a child; and for the last four years, more than one-quarter of the churches yearly have not baptized a child.

In the last five years, 1858—1862, four churches with 170 members have added none by profession. In the last four years, 1859—1862, 23 churches with 2,672 members have added none by profession. In the last 3 years, 1860-'62, 45 churches with 4,747 members have added none by profession. In the last two years, 1861-'62, 83 churches, with 9,447 members have added none by profession. In the last year, 127 churches with 15,851 members, added none by profession. For the last four years, 1859-'62, from one-third to one-half of the churches yearly have not added one by profession.

In these four years, 187 churches, two-thirds of the whole number, have lost more by death than they have gained by profession. In the same period the city churches, with every facility for growth, report fifteen more deaths than additions by profession; and last year the churches of only one city, New Haven, reported more professions than deaths.

In these years, ten large churches—only one of them a city church—with 2,633 members, have added only 9 by profession, while they have lost 233 by death—26 times as many as they have added. In this period one-half of the churches in the district of Middlesex Association have lost ten times as many by death as they have gained by profession; one-half the churches in the district of Windham Association have lost five times as many by death as they have gained by profession, and nine of the twenty-eight churches in that district, with 1,074 members, have in these years gained only 5 by profession, while they have lost 114 by death.

PRESBYTERIANISM IN THE UNITED STATES.

The following are from the Official Reports of the Old School and New School Presbyterian bodies. There are, besides, about eight or ten other sorts of Presbyterians in the country.

GENERAL VIEW of the Presbyterian Church (Old School) during the year ending May, 1863 :—	
Synods in connection with the General Assembly, - - -	35
Presbyteries, - - - -	172
Licentiates, - - - -	288
Candidates for the Ministry, -	399
Ministers, - - - -	2,205
Churches, - - - -	2,541
Members added on examination, -	8,781
Members added on certificate, -	6,535
Total No. Communicants reported, -	227,576
Adults baptized, - - - -	2,165
Infants baptized, - - - -	10,194
Amount contributed for Congregational purposes, -	\$1,294,885
Amount contributed for the Boards, - - - -	346,448
Amount contributed for Disabled Ministers' Fund, -	10,973
Amount contributed for Miscellaneous purposes, -	150,444
Whole amount contributed, -	\$1,802,650

GENERAL VIEW of the Presbyterian Church, (New School,) during the year ending May, 1863 :—	
Synods, - - - -	22
Presbyteries, - - - -	106
Licentiates, - - - -	162
Candidates, - - - -	191
Ministers, - - - -	1,616
Churches, - - - -	1,454
Added on examination, -	4,744
“ certificate, - - -	4,079
Total communicants, - -	135,894
Adults baptized, - - -	1,556
Infants “ - - - -	3,191
Amount contributed to Domestic Missions, - - -	\$122,407
Do. do. Foreign do. - -	80,528
Do. do. Education, - -	49,362
Do. do. Publication, - -	40,569
Do. do. General Assembly, -	6,263

AMERICAN UNITARIAN STATISTICS.

The Monthly Journal of the American Unitarian Association, gives the list of Societies, ministers, &c., from which we make up this general statement. In the list of societies there are the names of 256. “The Journal,” for January, 1863, gives the number of societies as 261; 69 societies of the 256 have no settled pastors, leaving, of course, 185 having regular pastors.

Boston has 18 societies, and all these pulpits are supplied by settled ministers. There are 17 chaplains in the army. We find that 93 societies are located out of Massachusetts, leaving to this State the balance, 163. Maine comes next, having 17. New Hampshire next, having 15, and New York next, having 14. These 3 States hold one-half of the number out of Massachusetts. 11 States have no Unitarian society in them, and 10 of these are slave States. The Universalist and the Christian bodies, and some of the Quakers, are theologically with them. The School in Cambridge has 20 students. The one in Meadville has 18, including 3 in the preparatory class. Cambridge graduated, last year, 7. Meadville, 5. Meadville has a Faculty of 7, and Cambridge has one of 3.

FREE-WILL BAPTISTS.

The following are the statistics of the Free-Will Baptists in the United States: There are 31 yearly meetings, 142 quarterly meetings,

2,285 churches, 1,033 ordained preachers, and 58,055 communicants. Maine contains the largest number of the denomination of any State in the Union—namely, 14,336; and New Hampshire the next largest—namely, 9,934. In Vermont, there are 2,842, and in Massachusetts and Rhode Island there are 4,560. There are none in Connecticut. Whole number in New England, 31,704, which leaves only 26,351 for all the rest of North America.

THOMAS PAINE, BISHOP COLENZO, ESSAYS AND REVIEWS.

The *one hundred and twenty-sixth* Anniversary of the birth-day of Thomas Paine, was lately celebrated at Empire Hall, New York City, by a supper, ball, &c. Supper was served at about midnight, and Mr. Hall, the chairman, made a few remarks about the political and theological creed of Paine. Toasts were offered and responses made by various gentlemen, who divulged their views about Deism, and theology, and God in Nature, and Nature in God, and progress, and other abstract and abstruse subjects. Mr. Edwards, an English gentleman, thought the views of Thomas Paine were continually receiving further recognition, and claimed as practical, if not nominal, disciples to them, the authors of "Essays and Reviews," and Bishop Colenso. One venerable gentleman, in a white neckcloth, argued that he was God, because he was made in the image of God. God, too, was made in his image, and consequently if any one were to ask him how he could see God, he would say, "look at me." This singular logic was received with applause.

SUMMARY OF FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

CONSECRATION OF THE BISHOP OF NASSAU.

On Monday, Nov. 30. 1863, being St. Andrew's Day, the Rev. Ad-dington Robert Peel Venables, M. A., was consecrated Bishop of Nassau, (Bahamas,) vacant by the death of the Rev. Dr. Caulfield. Mr. Venables is one of the youngest of the Bishops, being only thirty-five or thirty-six years old. He was educated at Eton School, graduated B. A. of Exeter College, Oxford, was awarded an honorary fourth in classics, and has been for many years a hard-working curate in Oxford, St. Paul's district being one of the poorest in that City. The service was held in the private chapel of Lambeth Palace, there being not more than fifty persons present. The officiating prelates were, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishops of Oxford and London. There was no singing nor chanting.

DEATH OF THE BISHOP OF ELY.

The Right Reverend THOMAS TURTON, Bishop of Ely, departed this life at his residence in London, on Thursday evening, January 7th, aged 84 years. The deceased prelate was a native of Yorkshire, and was born in 1782, and in 1801 became a pensioner of Queen's College, Cambridge. Two years afterwards, he migrated to St. Catharine's College, then known as Catharine Hall, from which house, in 1805, he proceeded B. A., being Senior Wrangler. In 1806 he was elected a Fellow of his College, and in the following year succeeded to the office of Tutor. In 1808 he took the degree of M. A., and served the office of Moderator for the years 1810, 1811 and 1812. In 1816 he took the degree of B. D., and in the same year he unsuccessfully contended for the office of Registrary of the University. In 1822 he was appointed Lucasian Professor of Mathematics, and in 1826 accepted the College living of Gimmingham-cum-Trunch, in the county of Norfolk, but was recalled by the University in the following year, by his election to the office of Regius Professor of Divinity, on the resignation of Bishop Kaye, being soon afterwards created D. D., by Royal Mandate. In 1830 he obtained the deanery of Peterborough, vacant by the promotion of Dr. Monk to the See of Gloucester. Dr. Turton filled this office until the year 1842, when he was appointed Dean of Westminster. In 1845 he was raised to the See of Ely, vacant by the death of Dr. Allen. As a controversialist, Bishop Turton has been rarely exceeded, being generally allowed to have obtained victories over Bishop Burgess, Lord Brougham, and Cardinal Wiseman. His Lordship's exquisite taste in the fine arts was well known, and he was the composer of several excellent pieces of Church music. His mild and amiable qualities, and his meek and charitable disposition, will make his loss much felt. Having suffered much from ill health, his Lordship has led a very retired life for several years, and has interfered very little either in political or ecclesiastical affairs. His Lordship was fifty-sixth Bishop of Ely, and was patron of thirty-eight livings, besides being official visitor of St. John's, Jesus, and Christ's Colleges, Cambridge. By the Bishop of Ely's decease, the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol obtains his seat in the House of Lords, from which Bishop Turton's successor, so long as he is junior Bishop, will be excluded. His Lordship was never married.

NEW BISHOP OF ELY.

Lord Palmerston has offered, in the name of the Crown, the vacant Bishopric of Ely to the Rev. Edward Harold Browne, B. D., Norrisian Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, Canon of Exeter, Principal of the Theological College at Exeter, and Chaplain to the Bishop. The Rev. E. H. Browne was educated at Eton and at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, where he graduated in 1832, when he was twenty-fourth wrangler and second in the third class in classics. In 1836 he was ordained by Dr. Allen, who was then Bishop of Ely, and was for some time afterwards Fellow and Tutor of his College. In 1841 he was presented to the incumbency of St. Sidwell, Exeter,

and held that appointment until 1843, when he became Vice-principal and Professor of Hebrew at St. David's College, Lampeter, on the nomination of Dr. Ollivant, now Bishop of Llandaff, to a Regius Professorship of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. During his tenure of this office, he was presented by the Bishop of St. David's to the prebendal stall of Llandewi-Aberarth, in the Cathedral Church of that Diocese, and by the College, to the sinecure Rectory of Llandewi-Velfrey, near Narbeth, Pembrokeshire. These appointments he held until 1849, when he was collated by the Bishop of Exeter to the vicarage of Kenwyn and St. Kea, near Truro. During the next ten years he worked his large parish with great success; and in 1857 he was nominated by the Dean and Chapter of Exeter, of which Cathedral he had meanwhile become one of the prebendaries, to the vicarage of Heavitree, Devonshire. In the same year he was appointed to a canonry residentiary in Exeter Cathedral; and on the appointment of Dr. Ellicott to the Bishopric of Gloucester and Bristol, succeeded him as principal of the Exeter Training College for candidates for Holy Orders. The Bishop nominate has also held, during the last ten years, the Norrisian Professorship of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. He is a sound Churchman, a good preacher, and for some time past has been an active member of the Lower House of Convocation. He is the author of "An Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles," "Sermons on the Atonement," and various theological works. He is a gentleman of very courteous manners, and is highly esteemed in the University of Cambridge, which forms part of his future Diocese.

CONVOCATION. PROVINCE OF CANTERBURY.

The Convocation of the Province of Canterbury began its annual formalities on Friday, Feb. 5th. The "Upper House" only had two representatives present.

Committees of the Lower House reported upon three questions, which have caused considerable agitation in the Church. The first relates to the Order for the Burial of the Dead; and the Committee charged with the consideration of this subject oppose any proposal for altering the service. The second question is that of Clerical Subscription; and here the Committee, while desirous of retaining the Subscription to the Thirty-Nine Articles and the Thirty-Sixth Canon, recommend a modification of the declaration of assent and consent, required from beneficed Clergymen only; and further propose the repeal of that portion of the act which requires lecturers to repeat their reading of the Common Prayer, with declaration of their assent thereto every month. The third Committee dealt with the question raised by Mr. Bouverie's Clergy Relief Bill. They insist upon the indelibility of Holy Orders, and submit, that "it would be most disastrous, if candidates for Holy Orders were ever led to look upon the Ministry as an experimental profession." These reports await discussion; and Archdeacon Denison has given notice of an amendment, the effect of which would be, to leave the rule of subscription as it stands.

PARLIAMENTARY AND IMPORTANT INTELLIGENCE.

THE OPENING OF PARLIAMENT.—On Thursday, Feb. 4, the sixth Session of the 18th Parliament of the present reign was opened by Royal Commission. The most important passage in the "Queen's Speech," read by the Lord Chancellor, was the following: "Her Majesty has directed that a commission shall be issued for the purpose of revising the various forms of subscription and declaration required to be made by the clergy of the Established Church. A copy of that commission will be laid before you."

There can be no question what this means; and we are glad to notice that some of the guardians of the Church and the organs of public sentiment are alive to the exigencies of the occasion. This unusual interference on the part of the Crown has been undoubtedly brought about by the management of such men as Stanley, and perhaps by one higher in office, who find themselves in danger of losing their positions, as they see matters rapidly ripening to a crisis. Now, they come forward in great distress of mind on account of their conscience!

The Queen has been pleased, by letters patent under the Great Seal of the United Kingdom, to appoint the Archbishops of Canterbury, York, Armagh, and Dublin; Earl Stanhope, the Earl of Harrowby, K. G.; the Bishops of London, Winchester, St. David's and Oxford; Lords Lyttelton, Cranworth, and Ebury; Mr. E. P. Bouviere, Dr. Lushington, the Right Hons. Spencer Walpole, Joseph Napier, and Sir J. T. Coleridge; Sir W. Heathcote, Bart.; Mr. C. Buxton, M. P.; the Deans of St. Paul's and Ely; Archdeacon Sandford, B. D., of Coventry; Dr. Jacobson, Regius Professor of Divinity, Oxford; Dr. Jeremie, Regius Professor of Divinity, Cambridge; the Rev. Henry Venn, B. D.; and the Rev. W. G. Humphrey, B. D., to be her Majesty's Commissioners to consider and revise the various forms of subscription and declaration required to be made by the clergy of the United Church of England and Ireland on ordination, or on appointment, admission, or induction to any ecclesiastical dignity, benefice, curacy, lectureship, or office, and to report their opinion how far they may be altered and simplified, consistently with due security for the declared agreement of the clergy with the doctrines of the Church, and their conformity to its Ritual. Among these, the Bishops of London, and St. David's, and the Dean of St. Paul's, (Milman,) and the Dean of Ely, (Hervey Goodwin,) have shown latitudinarian tendencies.

JUDGMENT OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL IN THE CASE OF WILLIAMS & WILSON.

"**ESSAYS AND REVIEWS.**"—The appeal in this great and important case came on before the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, on Monday, Feb. 8th. The two appeals, *Williams, Appellant, v. The Lord Bishop of Salisbury, Respondent*, and *Wilson, Appellant, v. Fendall, Respondent*, were taken together. It is scarcely necessary to say that these were appeals from judgments delivered by Dr. Lushington in the Court of Arches, whereby the defendants (the present appellants,) were found to have published and maintained certain doctrines and

opinions contrary to the teaching of the Church of England. Each of them was condemned to suspension for one year *ab officio et beneficio*, was monished not to offend in like manner for the future, and was condemned in costs. In the first case proceedings were instituted against Rev. Rowland Williams, D. D., Vice-Principal and Professor of Hebrew, St. David's College, Lampeter, Vicar of Broad Chalke, Wiltshire, founded on certain passages in the Essay entitled "Bunsen's Biblical Researches." In the second, against the Rev. Henry Bristow Wilson, Vicar of Great Staughton, Huntingdonshire, the author of the Essay, entitled "Séances Historiques de Genève; the National Church."

The appeals were heard some seven months ago, before the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord Chancellor, the Archbishop of York, the Bishop of London, Lord Cranworth, Lord Chelmsford and Lord Kingsdown. On that occasion each of the appellants argued his own case. The Queen's Advocate, Mr. Coleridge, Q. C., and Dr. Swabey then appeared for the respondents. The Lords of the Committee, before whom the appeals were heard, were present on Monday, with the exception of the two Archbishops.

The judgment was read by the Lord Chancellor. He said: "These appeals do not give to this tribunal the power, and therefore it is no part of its duty, to pronounce any opinion on the character, effect or tendency of the publications known by the name of 'Essays and Reviews.'" * * * * * We desire to repeat that the meagre and disjointed extracts which have been allowed to remain in the reformed articles are alone the subject of our judgment. On the design and general tendency of the book called "Essays and Reviews," and on the effect or aim of the whole essay of Dr. Williams, or the whole essay of Mr. Wilson, we neither can nor do pronounce any opinion. On the short extracts before us, our judgment is, that the charges are not proved. Their Lordships, therefore, will humbly recommend to Her Majesty that the sentences be reversed, and the reformed articles rejected in like manner as the rest of the original articles were rejected in the court below—namely, without costs; but inasmuch as the appellants have been obliged to come to this court, their Lordships think it right that they should have the costs of this appeal."

At the conclusion of the judgment the Lord Chancellor said—"I am desired by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Archbishop of York to state, that they do not concur in those parts of this judgment which relate to the 7th article of the charge against Dr. Williams, and to the 8th article of the charge against Mr. Wilson."

This decision, which involves questions of the gravest character, is arousing attention and anxiety, and well it may. Dr. Williams had been condemned as denying the Inspiration of Scripture and Justification by Faith; and Mr. Wilson also for denying the Inspiration of Scripture and the Eternal punishment of the wicked. The doctrine which, as the Supreme Court now rules, is not contradictory to the Church of England on these three points, Inspiration, Justification, and Universal Salvation, we are to gather from Dr. Williams' and Mr. Wilson's writings, and from the statements of the Court itself.

The Literary Churchman says, "We point out that the Court expressly *shelters itself* under the "Gorham principle," which was, that the *mind of the Church was not to be ascertained*; but the "formularies" were to be interpreted *legally*, and so that nothing should be condemned by the Court which the *letter of the law* had not expressly provided against. The principle was a monstrous one; but was hailed with a chorus of admiration, as the *εὐρηκα* which saved the deniers of Baptismal Regeneration from expulsion. The same "principle" now saves the denier of the Inspiration of the Bible, the impugner of Justification by Christ, and the assertor of Universal Salvation."

It seems to us that the decision, after all, is not so mischievous as has been pretended. The accused were arraigned upon certain charges, and those charges were made to rest on certain extracts from the "Essays and Reviews." All that the Court has decided, is, that by these extracts the charges are not proved. That is all.

THE TRIAL OF DR. COLENZO.

The trial of Bishop Colenso was commenced in St. George's Cathedral, Capetown, on Tuesday morning, the 17th November, at eleven o'clock. The Rt. Rev. Bishop Gray, Metropolitan of Capetown, presided, and was assisted by his Suffragans, the Bishops of Grahamstown and the Orange Free State (Twells.) The accusing clergy, Dean Douglass and Archdeacons Merriman and Badnall, were present in person to support their accusations, and Dr. Bleek, Curator of the Grey Library, attended as a personal friend of Dr. Colenso, to protest against the proceedings. He is described by the Archdeacon of George, to be "not only not a member of our communion, but well known to sympathize in the very strongest way with the freer sort of Socinianism." The charges, as read by the Registrar, were ably prepared and abundantly sustained by references to the Bishop's publications. They were nine in number, and are as follows. They are in regard to—1. The Atonement. 2. Justification by Faith. 3. The Sacraments. 4. Eternal Punishment. 5 and 6. The Inspiration of the Bible. 7. The Authenticity, Genuineness and Truth of certain Books of Holy Scripture. 8. The Infallibility of our Lord. 9. Bishop Colenso's Relation to the Liturgy. The charges in relation to the Atonement were founded on the statements in Bishop Colenso's Commentary on the Romans. The Dean of Capetown, in sustaining the accusations, occupied two days in a speech which as reported was evidently equal to the occasion. On the 14th of December, the two Assessors, the Bishop of Graham's-Town and the Bishop of the Free State, delivered elaborate opinions on the nine charges preferred against the Bishop of Natal by the three clerical prosecutors, and the Bishop of Capetown read his judgment and pronounced sentence. All the charges were declared established, and the offending Bishop was condemned and declared to be deposed from his office, and prohibited from ministering in any part of the province of Capetown, unless he retracts before the 16th of April. The decision is in the

following language: "Now, therefore, we, in the exercise of our jurisdiction aforesaid, do hereby, sentence, adjudge and decree the said Bishop of Natal to be deposed from the said office as such Bishop, and to be further prohibited from the exercise of any divine office within any part of the Metropolitan Province of Capetown.

But inasmuch as the said Bishop of Natal is not personally present, and we desire to afford him sufficient opportunity of retracting and recalling the extracts aforesaid, before this sentence shall take effect, we do suspend the operation of the said sentence, for the purpose of such retraction, until the 16th day of April next."

The question of course now arises as to the validity of the proceedings at Capetown, which must be acted upon by the Privy Council. That *Bishop Colenso* will have the *moral* support of such men as Stanley and Kingsley, and not unlikely of one at least of the English Bishops, is probable enough. The Low Church party in England have always opposed Colonial Church Bishops and Synods. What stand they will take now, remains to be seen. As for poor Bishop Colenso himself, if he has not lost his conscience and his manliness, with his orthodoxy, he will at last retire from a position which he cannot, in the judgment of his Peers, hold without moral dishonesty.

ROMANISM IN ENGLAND.

It may be remembered that a Roman Catholic Congress was held at Malines, in Belgium, in August last. At that Congress accounts were given, by fit speakers, of the state and prospects of Roman Catholicism in different countries of the world. It naturally fell to the lot of Cardinal Wiseman to represent the Roman Catholics of England, and to give an account of the state and prospects of the Roman Catholic religion. "You are aware, gentlemen," the Cardinal says at the outset, "that Catholicism in England is in a progressive state. This is a truth not only recognized by all members of the Catholic Church, but admitted also by those who do not belong to her. Everybody in England seems to acknowledge that Catholicism is daily gaining ground upon Protestantism." Having thus at once asserted his proposition, the Cardinal proceeds to illustrate and develop it. He marks three epochs in the recent history of Roman Catholicism in England, at each of which Roman Catholicism took a sudden bound forward, and increased its proportions relatively to the still-prevailing Protestantism of the apostate and obdurate little island. These three epochs are—(1) that of Catholic emancipation in 1829; (2) that of the extension of the Roman Catholic episcopate in England, in July, 1840, when Pope Gregory XVI. increased the number of Bishops, then still called Vicars-apostolical, from four to eight; and (3) that of the complete establishment, in 1850, of the present English Roman Catholic Hierarchy, as consisting of twelve Bishops and one Archbishop, openly invested with these titles. The following are the Cardinal's statistics exhibiting the progress made by the Roman Catholic religion in England during the thirty-four years marked so conspicuously by these three epochs:

The census of the population of England gives the following numbers of its inhabitants :

For the year	1831,	13,896,797
"	1841,	15,914,148
"	1851,	17,927,609
"	1861,	20,066,224

—that is, an increase of about two millions in each period of ten years. From 1831 to 1841 the population increased 14 per cent ; in the same period the number of priests was increased 25 per cent., or in nearly double the proportion. During the ten following years the population increased 13 per cent., the number of priests 45 per cent. Lastly, from 1851 to 1861, while the population increased 12 per cent. the number of priests has augmented by nearly 37.67 per cent. We see, therefore, that as the population increases, the number of our priests has grown in a double and even triple proportion. I will now give you some exact figures which will better enable you to judge of the consoling extension of the Catholic Church in England. In 1830 we numbered only 434 priests for the whole of England. We have now 1242, that is, three times as many within 60. The number of our churches, which was then only 410, now amounts to 872. From 16 convents which we possessed in 1830, we have risen in 1862 to 162. Lastly, while in 1830 no house of religious men existed there, in 1850 there were 11, and their number at present amounts to 53.

The Cardinal then goes more into detail, so as to fill up better for his Belgian hearers, the picture outlined by these general statistics. He naturally says a good deal about London.

In 1826 there were in London 48 Catholic priests ; in 1851, 113 ; in 1863, 194, (now above 200). The number of our churches for these three periods respectively amounts to 24, 46, and 102. At the first of these dates there was but one single convent, at the second 9 ; now there are above 25. Lastly, while, in 1826, religious houses of men and institutions of Catholic charity had no place in the statistics of the diocese, the first now amount to 15, the second to 34. These different pious institutions comprehend an hospital served by religious aggregated to the Order of St. John of Jerusalem, for whom a member of Parliament, a convert to Catholicism (Sir G. Bowyer) has just now erected, at his own expense, a convent and a magnificent church. They comprise also alms-houses for aged men and women, a large asylum of the Good Shepherd, three reformatories for young criminals of both sexes, six or seven orphanages for boys and girls, to which we hope to add, at no long distance of time, an asylum for deserted children. All this is, in a manner, new, and is a signal proof of the Divine goodness, and of the care with which our Lord watches over His children.

CONTINENTAL INTELLIGENCE

Our European record has been of late comparatively barren : and we are able to cull but a few items of especial religious interest. There is little or nothing new from the Continent relative to either of the

subjects, which more prominently occupy our attention at present,—i. e. the Russo Greek Movement and Italian Reform.

FRANCE.—Neither the sale nor the interest in the discussions aroused by Renan's *Viè de Jesus*, seems to have diminished; nor yet the conviction of many that the real result of its publication will prove to be for good to the cause of truth. Among the numerous replies which it has called forth, the brief but able refutation of Dr. Ed. de Presseusé, a distinguished Protestant divine, seems to have been most widely and cordially received, even in Roman Catholic circles.

The course of M. Duruy, the new Minister of Public Instruction, continues to be fraught with great promise, * The clerical party, of course, are increasingly more and more bitterly hostile to his programme.

BELGIUM.—As an offset to the Romish Congress at Malines, in August, a few weeks after, there was held a "Social Congress" at Ghent. It seem to have been composed of philanthropo-economists of every shade.—Romish, Protestant and "Liberal." The chief topics of discussion were,—(1) Capital punishment; (2) the province of the State in Education; (3) the morality of Art; and (4) The amelioration of the condition of the working classes. Jules Simon, one of the representatives lately elected at Paris, spoke most touchingly and effectively upon the latter subject; and a French Demoiselle, of the name of Roger,—under cover of the third subject,—ventured to trench upon American female prerogatives, and addressed the Congress, "an immense assembly," to the effect that the Gospel system of morality was obsolete, and that every one must now and henceforth be a moral law for him or herself. For the credit of the Congress, it should be added, that these views were received with a mixture of indignation and contempt. Thus extreme begets extreme: and it has "come to pass, that he who fleeth from the noise of the fear, shall fall into the pit; and he that cometh up out of the midst of the pit, shall be taken in the snare."

DENMARK.—The *Colonial Church Chronicle* speaks of a letter received by the Soc. Prom. Chr. Knowledge, from Rev. J. Vahl, "thanking the Society for the grant of Common Prayer Books in Danish." At a "Missionary Meeting at Srenborg, the eagerness to receive these books was very great." "Among the receivers were two of their Bishops, one of whom said, 'he was very much rejoiced to have the book, for which he had longed for several years:' and one of the Deans, to whom a copy had been sent, said in writing, that, 'this Danish Prayer Book was to him a most valuable gift, which he had longed after.'" Mr. Vahl asked for further supplies, adding, "Would to God that a closer connection and, if possible, an intercommunion may be established among our Churches; should this happen, the valuable gift of your Society will have been of no mean consequence to the attainment of this aim."

SWEDEN.—Renan's work has been translated and published in Stockholm; but, says the correspondent of the *Christian Work*, here

as elsewhere, Renan has become the instrument of causing men to read the Bible, and learn more concerning Jesus Christ."

BAVARIA.—A conference of Roman Catholic theologians has lately been held at Munich, in which Dr. Döllinger took a conspicuous part.

ITALY.—An amusing result of the publication of Renan's *Viè de Jesus*, at Milan is, that the Italian clergy, in their consternation and inability to deal with the intruder, are actually calling Protestants to the rescue. The reply of Dr. Presseusé, above mentioned, has been circulated by the priests; and a Dominican preacher at Leghorn, it is stated, exclaimed—"And yoa, oh Waldenses! it behooves you to come forward at such a time as this, with a refutation of such attacks against the religion you profess!" The Roman Curia have, however, put the book at once into the *Index*, and appealed to the Virgin, whose images and pictures are responding on every side by *winking their eyes*.

The Waldenses are enlarging and expanding their operations. At the same time there is a growing separation between their work and the proselytism of the various foreign Sects which are multitudinously sending missionaries to Italy. The former become more conservative as they more fully understand the field: and while their indefatigable zeal and faith flags not, they are openly asking what there is yet in their system which is an obstacle to their highest success.

The friends of a proselyting policy are also beginning to perceive that there *is*, after all, what they have hitherto resolutely denied—a real movement in the Church against not only Papal government but also Romish corruptions of doctrines. The *Christian Work* for Dec. announces this as a new discovery on the part of its correspondent.

The priests have, in Florence and elsewhere, effected a combination which deprives the "Evangelical" congregations of the power to hire a place of worship; and it would seem not unlikely that the Waldensians, who buy their *locale*, would be left alone in possession of the field.

In January last, a new quarto Monthly Journal, *L'Esaminatore*, appeared in Florence. The second number is before us, and gives evidence of having been established upon a far firmer basis, both intellectual and business-like, than any of its predecessors. Its mottoes,—the one from the Scriptures,—“Stand ye in the way, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein:” and the other, the dictum of Tertullian, “Il quod verius primo, il prius quod ab initio”—together with its title, very clearly indicate the part which *L'Esaminatore* is designed to play. We think we can also add, that the assistance of Anglican divines will not be foreign either to its purpose or its columns.

A Committee appointed some years since for that purpose, have reported to the Pope, some modifications of the Roman ritual, called for by the New Dogma; and a papal brief has recently announced these to the Church. The Eternal City has lately been the scene of another Mortara case, in the abduction, forcible detention, “conversion” and baptism of a little Jewish girl of ten years old.

A society has been organized at Messina for the promotion of "sound Scriptural knowledge among the masses;" and it has made overtures to the London *Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge*, with which it desires to be in correspondence. It seems, that about twenty-five persons, have, in this city, organized themselves into a congregation, under the charge of a worthy Franciscan priest,—avowedly modeling their usages after the example of the Church of England, and using the Italian translation of the Prayer Book as their Liturgy.

CHURCH IN THE SANDWICH ISLANDS.

Not long since, the Rev. Dr. Anderson, Secretary of the A. B. C. F. M. of the United States, made a visit to the Sandwich Islands, to look after the Presbyterian and Congregational Mission, on which that Board has, for so many years, expended freely of its resources. From the very remarkable report, which the Doctor made on his return, of the great results of the Mission, and from the intimations thrown out, that their work was done, and the gross imputations cast in their newspapers upon the English Church Mission, we suspected that other important intelligence from the Islands, might be expected. The lamentable condition of morality in the Islands, has been alluded to by travellers for years, showing that the new civilization had failed to reach and elevate the people. The English Bishop of Honolulu, under date of Sept. 9, 1863, gives the results of the Church Mission during its brief history. An Industrial Boarding School, a Grammar School, a Visiting Society to provide for the sick, with the plainest teachings of the Church of Christ, are already producing the most cheering results. Besides giving the details of the practical working of the Mission, the Bishop says, "the King has finished his translation of the Prayer-book, with a very sound and interesting Explanatory Preface, written entirely by himself, and I have the pleasure of sending six copies of it to the S. P. G. by this mail.

"We, soon after our arrival, began to discover the great wants of the people. We found a great prevalence of heathen superstitions, under a thin coating of Puritan Christianity. "Praying to death," attempting to cure the sick by magical incantations, and sacrifices to the old heathen deities, are almost universal, and are thought quite compatible with the highest (Christian) religious professions. Some who practise the art of praying to death, are even to be found among the Deacons of "the Calvinist Church."

"I will not speak of the general immorality of the native women; it is well known even in England, but I have no hesitation in saying that it has been greatly increased by the school system established here. The boys and girls, the young men and young women, have been brought together in the same classes at school, and left together out of school, with the consequences which might have been anticipated. * * * * * Considering the tens of thousands, France and America have lavished on these islands, in the interests of Popery and Puritanism, is it too much to ask Englishmen,—the discoverers of the group, the first invited to evangelize it, the last to enter the work,—to aid us in measures

which, by God's blessing, may actually preserve a nation, marked by many noble traits, from physical extinction?"

DEATH OF THE KING OF HAWAII, KAMEHAMEHA IV.

The king, who had been in ill health for some months, succumbed unexpectedly to the exhaustion produced by diarrhœa, on Monday, Nov. 30, 1863. He was a very able and excellent man, whose whole heart was in the work of elevating his people, and he was the mainstay of the English Mission, which went out at his request a year ago, to which he looked as the great means of their regeneration. A remarkable career, and a reign of nine years, have closed suddenly before the King of Hawaii had quite reached the age of 30. The death of their only child, the Prince of Hawaii, a noble and forward boy of between four and five, which happened sixteen months ago, inflicted a blow from which his parents have never recovered. On the powerful frame and the passionate and concentrative character of the King, the affliction fell with proportionate force, and he never after the shock recovered his health completely. In the deep retirement which the King and Queen sought after the death of their child, Kaméhaméha occupied his time and thoughts in making a translation of the English Prayer-book, some copies of which, together with the King's original preface, have just been received in that country. The work was a strangely-selected anodyne for a chieftain of the Pacific in his grief, and its execution is more remarkable even than the undertaking, the Royal translator having worked out the tables for finding Easter, &c. The transcendental ideas of the Athanasian Creed were the only difficulties the King could not surmount, there being no corresponding expressions for them in the meagre languages of Polynesia. Out of the five successive rulers who have borne this patronymic, three have visited Europe—the new King being one of them. The little leaven which the last Kaméhaméha gathered in the Eastern World, leavened his whole lump, and made him, in ideas, preferences, and ambition, thoroughly European. Prince Lot Kaméhaméha, the brother of the late king, succeeds under the title of Kaméhaméha V. He has confirmed the Prime Minister, Mr. Wyllie, in his office, and given assurances to the Bishop of his support to the Mission.

THE JESUITS IN POLAND.

Nothing is more commonly asserted than that the Dissidents, as the Protestants were called, betrayed the independence of their country, by calling in the aid of Russia, in the year 1767. But what are the facts? Why, fifty years before that period, in 1716, it is well known that the Jesuits, with Count Sanianowski, Bishop of Cracow, at their head, entered into a treaty with Russia, in which it was agreed that Poland should be virtually disarmed, by a reduction of its army from 80,000 to 18,000. This shameful piece of treachery, which was protested against by all the better portions of the Roman Catholic clergy, was perpetrated with the view of securing the power, granted in the same treaty, of putting down the Dissidents, by depriving them of all the

rights and liberties they had so long enjoyed ! For fifty years, as the fruit of this disgraceful compact, did the unhappy kingdom become the scene of civil war and religious strife. Gradually were the rights of the Protestant Dissenters trampled into the dust. Upwards of sixty of their churches were wrested from them or levelled to the ground. The free exercise of their religion was reduced almost to nothing ; no person was exempt from persecution, or could calculate on security for life or property ; their clergy were dragged before Romish tribunals ; their members were excluded from the magistracy, and declared incapable of bearing witness in the courts of justice ; their nobles were excluded from the senate, and subjected to all sorts of indignities ; their sacraments and sepulture forbidden ; their marriages were pronounced invalid, if not celebrated by the Romish priests, and their children declared illegitimate. Who can wonder if, in such circumstances, the Dissidents should have appealed to Russia, and to the Protestant powers of Europe for protection of their rights and liberties, guarantied to them by the law and constitution of their country ? Count Krasinski blames them for this, as indeed he denounces all foreign intervention, as fatally injurious to his country. But who drove them into this last resource ? It was the ultramontane party in the Church of Rome.

When the true history of the present trouble in Poland comes to be written, it will be found that the War has been stirred up by the same Jesuit party, in connection with the Polish aristocracy in the interests of the Jesuits, and that its real object is to arrest the progress of the Greek Church and the decline of Popery. In other words, it is a War in behalf of the Romish religion.

WESTERN AFRICA.

According to the Colonial "Blue Book" of England, recently issued, there was in 1860 a population of 41,624 in the Colonies of Sierra-Leone, and 11,418 dwellings. Of the population, 15,682 were liberated Africans, and 22,593 had been born within the limits of the colony. Of the whole population, only 3,351 still remained Pagans, and only 1,734 were Mohammedans. There were 15,130 Methodists, and 12,954 Episcopalians ; 11,016 children were taught in the schools that year. Christianity has done much for the civilization and happiness of the people of that portion of Africa, and will do more.

EUROPEAN LIBRARIES.

The following is a list of the libraries in Europe, that contain over 300,000 volumes each :—Imperial Library, Paris, 900,000 ; Royal Library, Munich, 800,000 ; British Museum, London, 600,000 ; Royal Library, Berlin, 500,000 ; Imperial Library, St. Petersburg, 450,000 ; University Library, Munich, 400,000 ; Royal Library, Copenhagen, 400,000 ; Imperial Library, Vienna, 350,000 ; University Library, Gottingen, 350,000 ; University Library, Breslau, 350,000 ; Royal Library, Dresden, 320,000 ; Bodleian Library, Oxford, 310,000.